REFLECTIONS
ON THE
RELATION
OF THE
ENGLISH REFORMATION,
Lately Printed at
OXFORD.

PART I.

AMSTERDAM:
Printed for *J. S.* 1688.

REFLECTIONS
ON THE
RELATION
OF THE
ENGLISH REFORMATION, &c.

The First Part.

The INTRODUCTION.

WE have been long in Expectation of ſome extraordinary *Productions* of the Eminent Convert of *Oxford*. His Age, his Learning, and the preſent Conjuncture hath raiſed that Expectation very high; and tho the ill ſucceſs of his Diſcourſes concerning the Preſence in the Sacrament, and the Adoration of it, hath ſunk his Reputation to a great Degree; it having appeared that he neither writes exactly, nor ſincerely, which hath leſſened him much in the Opinion of thoſe, who expected great things from him. Yet it was thought that matters of Hiſtory would ſucceed better in his hand; for it hath been long believed, that he had exa-

mined thoſe Tranſactions very critically; ſo that when I heard that he had undertaken this Subject, I expected great Diſcoveries from him, and fancied that inſtead of *Extracts* out of *Fuller* and *Heylin*, we ſhould have found *Records*, *Originals*, *Papers*, and the *Cotton-Library*, often cited. So it may be eaſily apprehended how much I was ſurpriſed, when I found a Book of ſuch a Volume, in which there was not the leaſt Diſcovery of any new matters of Fact; and that there was nothing in it, but a tedious Repetition (very ill expreſſed in rough Engliſh) of Arguments that have been over and over again, both made and refuted; together with a Repreſentation of the ſtate of Affairs in the laſt Age, that was partly defective, and partly falſe. It ſeemed ſtrange to me at firſt view, to ſee ſo large a Book writ and printed eight years after that Dr. *Burnet*'s Hiſtory of the Reformation had appeared, without its taking the leaſt notice of that Work, which hath been ſo well received, ſo much read, and which ſeems to be ſo well confirmed by the Proofs that accompany it, that few Books of Hiſtory have gained a more general Reputation than it hath done; and as none of the *Roman* Communion have been able hitherto, to ſay any thing for the Diſparagement of that Work, except Mr. *Varillas*; ſo he hath been ſo ſeverely expoſed by the Dr. that this attempt hath raiſed its Credit, inſtead of leſſening of it.

It is true, This Book ſeems to be a part of a great Work, and to have been writ many years ago. For as this appears in many Parts of it, ſo more remarkably in one Paſſage, that ſhews it was written in the Interval between His *Late Majeſties being re-eſtabliſhed in his Throne, and the Reſtauration of Biſhops*; and therefore, when this Book was writ, the Author could not vouch other Hiſtorians, than ſuch as had then appeared: Yet, ſince the printing

P. 82. ad finem.

printing of it was delayed ſo long; and ſince it is believed, that the Author and the Publiſher is the ſame Perſon, he might have given himſelf the trouble to have reviewed his Work, or at leaſt to have added ſome Appendix relating to that more copious and authentical Account which Dr. *Burnet* hath given us of our *Reformation*. For if the *Dr.* hath deceived the World by a falſe Repreſentation of Matters; yet it muſt be confeſſed, that he hath done it with ſo good a Grace, and with ſuch appearances of Sincerity, and of proving what he relates, and that both our Countrymen and Forreigners have read that Work ſo much (as appears by the ſeveral Impreſſions at home, and the ſeveral Tranſlations that have been printed beyond Sea) that it was too great an Omiſſion in the Author of this Recital, if he be ſtill alive, that he hath never mentioned that Hiſtory, nor ſaid any thing to ruin the Reputation it hath gained.

I am, I confeſs, much inclined to believe, that he who hath publiſhed this Book, could not have writ it. For as there is nothing in it that anſwers the Reputation he hath in the World; ſo the time of writing it, ſeems a Demonſtration that he cannot be the Author of it. For what Opinion can we have of a mans Conſcience, of his Probity, or his Honour, that could write ſuch a Book againſt the *Reformation*, and the *Church* of *England* in the year 1660. and yet could continue in the Communion of our Church, concurring not only in the *Acts* of our *daily Worſhip*, but mixing with us in the Holy Sacrament twenty five years after this! Such a Criminal Compliance hath ſo many foul Characters upon it, that after all the Charity to which a man can carry his thoughts, he can ſcarce know how to have one good thought of a perſon capable of ſo black and ſuch a long-continued diſſimulation, both towards God and Man. Whether Oaths and Subſcriptions have not come in likewiſe

wiſe to enhance the guilt of ſo horrid a Diſſimulation, I do not know; but even tho that hath not been in the caſe, God and Man hath been ſufficiently mocked. This is that which makes me very unwilling to believe that the Author of this Book could continue in all the Acts of viſible Communion with this Church, ſo many years after he writ it; tho I confeſs he ſpeaks ſo ſoftly, and with ſo lit-
From p. 140. tle Deteſtation of the compliance of the Popiſh Clergy in *Edward* the *6th*'s time, that this looks too like a man that was reſolved to venture on the ſame guilt; for he tells us in his harſh Stile, That the *perpetual outward compliance of ſome other Biſhops contrarily affected, ſince there preceded before it penalties and Fears, and the ſeeing of the prime Biſhops to be impriſoned and ejected for ſtanding out, is far from an authentical Conſent, and unjuſtly reckoned as ſuch. For tho none can know mens Hearts, but by their outward appearances, yet where mens Votes are asked, after Penalties, Impriſonments of others, Threats,* &c. *which are ſo ſtrong motives of Diſſimulation. Now all that conform in theſe, are to be preſumed Compliers, and none free Voters.* And afterwards without expreſſing any horror at it, he owns, *That many of the inferior Clergy remained ſtill of the old Religion*;
Page 141. which he goes about to prove by ſeveral Reaſons. And yet after all this, there was nothing to be apprehended in K. *Edward*'s days, by ſuch of the Clergy as would not receive the Reformation, but the loſs of their Benefices; which (if we are not miſtaken in the Man) our Author felt to be ſuch a *ſtrong motive of Diſſimulation*, that he reſolved to be overcome by it. If a ſingle Act of impious Worſhip againſt a mans Conſcience, was thought ſo heinous a crime by the Primitive Church, that it could not be expiated, but by a Penitence of many years continuance; then certainly, the ſame Sin repeated in the courſe of ſo many years, againſt ſuch clear Convictions of Conſcience,

ſcience, muſt be confeſſed to be ſo heinous a Tranſgreſſion, that according to the Spirit of the Primitive Times, ſuch an Offender could have expected no other Grace, but to obtain the Peace of the Church in his laſt agonies. To ſee a man change, is natural, eſpecially where a preſent Intereſt is the motive; but it is a degree of impiety, of which one would hope there are few men capable to lye ſo long, and ſo ſolemnly both to God and man. But I come now to look a little more narrowly into the matter of this Treatiſe.

I will not at all engage my ſelf to examine a great many Paſſages that are cited in it, out of ſome of our Authors, and in particular out of Dr. *Heylin*, and Mr. *Thorndike*: When we object to thoſe of the Church of *Rome* ſome things out of *Eraſmus* or *Caſſander*; or for Hiſtorical Matters, when we cite *P. Paul* or *Thuanus*; we know with how much neglect they put by theſe Authorities, as if they were not concerned in them; tho theſe *Perſons* lived and dyed in the Viſible Communion of their *Church*. And I do not ſee why we may not take the ſame liberty with ſuch Writers, that tho they have been in Communion with our *Church*, yet have it ſeems continued in it with ſome difficulty. And it will not appear very ſtrange if at the end of our *civil Wars* thoſe Perſons, who ſaw the ill effects of ſome ill Principles very apparently were carried by the impreſſions which thoſe Confuſions made upon them, to oppoſe thoſe diſorders by an over-bending of their notions to the other Extream. For this is an exceſs to which the humane nature is ſo liable, that it were a wonder if all Writers, eſpecially men of warm Tempers, that had been ſower'd by ill uſage, had been preſerved from it; ſo that I will wholly wave all that he cites from theſe or any others of our Authors, and will come to the matters themſelves.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of the Importance of thoſe Matters Objected to the Reformation, ſuppoſing them all true.

THE Diſputes that we had with the Church of *Rome* were at firſt managed with more ſincerity by our Adverſaries, than they have been of late; They juſtified their Church in thoſe Points for which we accuſed her, and objected the ſtrongeſt things they could to ours; but when they felt their Cauſe too weak to be maintained by fair methods, then they betook themſelves to others that were indeed leſs ſincere, but yet were more apt to make impreſſions on weak minds. In *France*, and among us, Three new Methods have appeared of late Years. The Firſt was to take off men from entring into the merits of the Cauſe, and to prepoſſeſs them with ſuch prejudices againſt the Reformation, as might lead them to condemn it without examining: To a diſcerning mind this method furniſhes the ſtrongeſt of all prejudices againſt thoſe who uſe it; this ſhews ſuch a diſtruſt of the Cauſe it ſelf, and it diſcovers it ſelf ſo plainly to be a trick, that it gives every man a juſt ground of indignation againſt thoſe who fly to it: Beſides, that it affords a good Plea to all men to continue in the Religion in which they were born and bred, without hearkning to any new diſcoveries; for if the Grounds upon which the Reformation was made, were good, it ſignifies little to an Enquirer into Truth, whether this Work was ſet on foot, and managed with all the exactneſs and regularity that might have been deſired, or not. Truth is always Truth, from what hand ſoever it comes; and the right way to find it out, is to free our minds from all prejudices, that ſo we may examine matters with unprepoſſeſſed underſtandings. A Se-

A Second Method is to perſwade the World that we have not yet underſtood one another; that *Popery* hath only appeared odious, becauſe it was *Miſrepreſented* to the world in falſe colours, but that it will be found to be quite another thing if it is truly *repreſented.* The *Biſhop* of *Meaux* had the honour to begin this piece of *Legerdemain*; our men of the *Miſſion* here have too ſlender a ſtock of their own, and therefore they give us the *French Mode* in Controverſie, as well as our Gallants do it in Cloaths; ſo they have thought to do wondrous feats with this method of *Repreſenting*; but the want of ſincerity of that Prelate, in this as well as in other things, hath been ſo evidently made out, that if ſome men had not a ſecret that makes them proof againſt all diſcoveries, he would be a little out of Countenance; and our *Repreſenters* here are ſo expoſed, that nothing is wanting for their conviction, but a ſenſe of that ſhame with which they have been covered; it is indeed a ſtrange piece of confidence in men, to come and offer to convince the World, That after Diſputes of 150 years continuance, neither ſide hath underſtood the ſtate of the Controverſie: and tho the ſame Decrees of Councils, and the ſame Forms of Worſhip are ſtill received; yet all theſe things muſt of a ſudden ſo change their nature, that in defiance of all that, which upon other occaſions, they ſay in behalf of *Tradition*, a new diſcovery ſhould be made, giving us new ſenſes of all thoſe things; but whatſoever ſucceſs that Book may have had, where a plundering Army managed the Argument, yet it is become now as ridiculous here, as it is pretended to have been ſucceſsful beyond Sea.

A Third Method is the ſetting up the Credit of *Oral Tradition*, not upon the Authority of ſome paſſages of Scripture, but upon this general Topic, that one Age muſt needs have delivered the ſame Faith to the ſucceeding

Age, that it had received from that which went before it; and by conſequence, that we muſt have in the preſent Age, the ſame Doctrine which the Apoſtles delivered at firſt, 17 Ages ago. It was found, That the Authority of the Church could not well be founded on paſſages of Scripture, for then we muſt be allowed firſt to believe the Scripture, and its Authority and Genuineneſs, and then to inquire into the meaning of thoſe Paſſages, and to examine to which of all the different Churches that are in the world, they do belong: Now it was apparent, That if it were once allowed, that we may carry our enquiries ſo far as to be able to ſettle our ſelves in theſe points, then this Infallible Authority is not ſo neceſſary to us, as they would make us believe, ſince we are ſuppoſed to have found good Proofs for believing the Scriptures, and for diſcovering the true meaning of the hardeſt paſſages in them, without its help. Now this would ſpoil all, and throw out thoſe Arguments that perſwade us of the neceſſity of an infallible Judg, both for our finding out, and for our expounding the Scriptures; they are now ſenſible of all this, and ſee that it is a very falſe Method of arguing to prove the Scriptures by the Church, when the Church muſt be firſt proved by the Scriptures; and therefore they do betake themſelves to the Infallibility of Oral Tradition, founding it upon this General Topic, That all the men of one Age muſt needs have inſtructed the following Age in the ſame Faith that they had received from the former Age, and upon this a great many imaginary Impoſſibilities are reckoned up to ſhew, that this could not fail, and ſo they infer the certainty of this method of conveyance. Now this is ſo extravagantly ridiculous, and ſo contrary to the common experience of all mankind, that all that can poſſibly be ſaid to ſupport it, ſignifies no more but to ſhew how many fine things a man

man of wit can ſay to prove the impoſſibility of a thing which yet every man of ſenſe knows is not only poſſible, but is ſo certain an effect of ſuch an Oral Conveyance, that it is rather impoſſible it ſhould not fail. How was the firſt Oral Tradition of the Religion delivered to *Adam*, corrupted? Tho the long lives of the firſt Patriarchs is a much ſtronger Argument for proving the impoſſibility of ſuch a corruption, than any that theſe Gentlemen can alledg. How was the Jewiſh Religion corrupted in our Saviour's time, tho the only Scene of their Solemn Worſhip being at *Jeruſalem*, and the aſſembling of their whole Nation in their Temple, three times a year, are much ſtronger inducements to make us conclude that it was impoſſible for an Oral Conveyance to miſcarry among them, than any that can be pretended to amongſt Chriſtians. Do we not ſee that the moſt common Tranſactions are ſo diverſified after they have paſſed through a few hands, that Truth is very ſoon loſt, when it hath no better Standard than Fame and Chat? Do not all Languages change ſo much in a courſe of ſome ages, that thoſe who lived here 500 years ago, would be no more underſtood, if they were now among us; and yet it were eaſie to point out the Infallibility of the conveyance of a Language with much livelier colours than theſe men can lay on here. If Oral Tradition hath any pretenſion to certainty, it muſt be chiefly with relation to ſuch things as are ſenſible and viſible, and that fall under the obſervation of all men; for in matters that are ſpeculative, it is natural for every man to dreſs them according to thoſe explications with which he cloaths them; and if his Reputation either for Piety, Learning, or a true underſtanding of matters is eſtabliſhed, it is ſo probable, that theſe will be ſo well received, that what was believed in one age in ſome general words, will be believed in another, with the addition of thoſe new explications, that

it were indeed a wonder if it were otherwiſe, eſpecially in Ages of Ignorance and Superſtition: If it is found that in things which are ſenſible, this Oral Tradition is ſo certainly changed, that we are as ſure of it as we can poſſibly be of any matter of Hiſtory; then it is a vain thing to go about to perſwade us, that this is an infallible conveyance in matters of Doctrine, ſince it is plain, that the one is much more like to be ſure, than the other can ever be ſuppoſed to be. If in the Worſhip of God the Adoration of Images and Saints, and an infinity of new Rites are brought in; if in the Sacrament, the Adoration of it, the denying the Cup to all except the Prieſt, the *denying the Sacrament* to Infants; if in the Government of the Church the Popes have not only brought the other Biſhops to become ſubject to them, but have broke through the Authority of Metropolitans, and the Equality that was ſetled between themſelves and the other Patriarchs, tho theſe things were enacted by the firſt General Councils; if Popes have got poſſeſſion of an Authority over Princes, when they were either Hereticks, or were favourers of Hereticks, and have maintained this Poſſeſſion theſe laſt 600 years; if, I ſay, all theſe things, which are not only ſenſible, but are very contrary to thoſe Inclinations and Intereſts, that are the powerful Springs of human nature, have yet been brought into the world ſo manifeſtly, is it any wonder, if in dark ages (in which a blind Obedience, and an unreſerved Submiſſion to Church-men were looked on as the chief Branches of Catholick Religion) a great many new Doctrines, that were infinitely for the advantage of a corrupt and deſigning Clergy were introduced and received: Inſtead of wondring at the ſucceſs of all theſe Innovations, we ſhould have had much more reaſon to wonder if they had not prevailed.

But upon the whole matter, all theſe new Methods ſhew

ſhew us, that thoſe who manage them, ſee the weakneſs of the old ones, and that their Cauſe cannot be maintained on that bottom, on which the Writers of Controverſy had at firſt put it; and that therefore they muſt a little change their way; and this being an age, in which Wit and fine Thoughts are highly valued, thoſe who fancied they were Maſters in thoſe, hoped to raiſe a ſunk Cauſe; which how ſucceſsful ſoever it may be, when it is managed by *Dragoons*, yet hath never appeared more naked and deſpicable, than it hath done of late years. Therefore they have given this new *Air* and Turn to the common Subjects of the Authority of the Church, and of Tradition, and have betaken themſelves to the certainty of Oral Tradition, as their laſt retrenchment; and after all thoſe Declamations that have been made of late, againſt thoſe who pretended not to carry the aſſurance of our Religion beyond a moral certainty, they now fly to a Plea, which if it were true, is but at moſt a moral certainty; but is ſo far from being true, that we have as much certainty as we can have for a negative Propoſition, that it is and ever muſt be falſe.

The Author of this Treatiſe offers us a new Eſſay of one of theſe late Methods; for inſtead of attacking our Reformation in any of its eſſential Parts, he goes about only to prove that it was not Canonical; and all this, when it were granted to be true, amounts to no more than this, that the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome* having been extreamly advantageous to the Clergy, the greater part of them were too much locked up in Ignorance, and too much addicted to their Intereſts to admit of any change; and that therefore the leſſer part was forced to make uſe of the Civil-power to ſupport them in reforming thoſe Abuſes. But this muſt be acknowledged to be lawful; otherwiſe all National-Reformations from received Errors, are no more to be thought on. For, ſuppoſe an Error hath overſpread a Na-

Age, that it had received from that which went before it; and by conſequence, that we muſt have in the preſent Age, the ſame Doctrine which the Apoſtles delivered at firſt, 17 Ages ago. It was found, That the Authority of the Church could not well be founded on paſſages of Scripture, for then we muſt be allowed firſt to believe the Scripture, and its Authority and Genuineneſs, and then to inquire into the meaning of thoſe Paſſages, and to examine to which of all the different Churches that are in the world, they do belong: Now it was apparent, That if it were once allowed, that we may carry our enquiries ſo far as to be able to ſettle our ſelves in theſe points, then this Infallible Authority is not ſo neceſſary to us, as they would make us believe, ſince we are ſuppoſed to have found good Proofs for believing the Scriptures, and for diſcovering the true meaning of the hardeſt paſſages in them, without its help. Now this would ſpoil all, and throw out thoſe Arguments that perſwade us of the neceſſity of an infallible Judg, both for our finding out, and for our expounding the Scriptures; they are now ſenſible of all this, and ſee that it is a very falſe Method of arguing to prove the Scriptures by the Church, when the Church muſt be firſt proved by the Scriptures; and therefore they do betake themſelves to the Infallibility of Oral Tradition, founding it upon this General Topic, That all the men of one Age muſt needs have inſtructed the following Age in the ſame Faith that they had received from the former Age, and upon this a great many imaginary Impoſſibilities are reckoned up to ſhew, that this could not fail, and ſo they infer the certainty of this method of conveyance. Now this is ſo extravagantly ridiculous, and ſo contrary to the common experience of all mankind, that all that can poſſibly be ſaid to ſupport it, ſignifies no more but to ſhew how many fine things a man

man of wit can ſay to prove the impoſſibility of a thing which yet every man of ſenſe knows is not only poſſible, but is ſo certain an effect of ſuch an Oral Conveyance, that it is rather impoſſible it ſhould not fail. How was the firſt Oral Tradition of the Religion delivered to *Adam*, corrupted? Tho the long lives of the firſt Patriarchs is a much ſtronger Argument for proving the impoſſibility of ſuch a corruption, than any that theſe Gentlemen can alledg. How was the Jewiſh Religion corrupted in our Saviour's time, tho the only Scene of their Solemn Worſhip being at *Jeruſalem*, and the aſſembling of their whole Nation in their Temple, three times a year, are much ſtronger inducements to make us conclude that it was impoſſible for an Oral Conveyance to miſcarry among them, than any that can be pretended to amongſt Chriſtians. Do we not ſee that the moſt common Tranſactions are ſo diverſified after they have paſſed through a few hands, that Truth is very ſoon loſt, when it hath no better Standard than Fame and Chat? Do not all Languages change ſo much in a courſe of ſome ages, that thoſe who lived here 500 years ago, would be no more underſtood, if they were now among us; and yet it were eaſie to point out the Infallibility of the conveyance of a Language with much livelier colours than theſe men can lay on here. If Oral Tradition hath any pretenſion to certainty, it muſt be chiefly with relation to ſuch things as are ſenſible and viſible, and that fall under the obſervation of all men; for in matters that are ſpeculative, it is natural for every man to dreſs them according to thoſe explications with which he cloaths them; and if his Reputation either for Piety, Learning, or a true underſtanding of matters is eſtabliſhed, it is ſo probable, that theſe will be ſo well received, that what was believed in one age in ſome general words, will be believed in another, with the addition of thoſe new explications, that

it were indeed a wonder if it were otherwiſe, eſpecially in Ages of Ignorance and Superſtition: If it is found that in things which are ſenſible, this Oral Tradition is ſo certainly changed, that we are as ſure of it as we can poſſibly be of any matter of Hiſtory; then it is a vain thing to go about to perſwade us, that this is an infallible conveyance in matters of Doctrine, ſince it is plain, that the one is much more like to be ſure, than the other can ever be ſuppoſed to be. If in the Worſhip of God the Adoration of Images and Saints, and an infinity of new Rites are brought in; if in the Sacrament, the Adoration of it, the denying the Cup to all except the Prieſt, the *denying the Sacrament* to Infants; if in the Government of the Church the Popes have not only brought the other Biſhops to become ſubject to them, but have broke through the Authority of Metropolitans, and the Equality that was ſetled between themſelves and the other Patriarchs, tho theſe things were enacted by the firſt General Councils; if Popes have got poſſeſſion of an Authority over Princes, when they were either Hereticks, or were favourers of Hereticks, and have maintained this Poſſeſſion theſe laſt 600 years; if, I ſay, all theſe things, which are not only ſenſible, but are very contrary to thoſe Inclinations and Intereſts, that are the powerful Springs of human nature, have yet been brought into the world ſo manifeſtly, is it any wonder, if in dark ages (in which a blind Obedience, and an unreſerved Submiſſion to Church-men were looked on as the chief Branches of Catholick Religion) a great many new Doctrines, that were infinitely for the advantage of a corrupt and deſigning Clergy were introduced and received: Inſtead of wondring at the ſucceſs of all theſe Innovations, we ſhould have had much more reaſon to wonder if they had not prevailed.

But upon the whole matter, all theſe new Methods ſhew

ſhew us, that thoſe who manage them, ſee the weakneſs of the old ones, and that their Cauſe cannot be maintained on that bottom, on which the Writers of Controverſy had at firſt put it; and that therefore they muſt a little change their way; and this being an age, in which Wit and fine Thoughts are highly valued, thoſe who fancied they were Maſters in thoſe, hoped to raiſe a ſunk Cauſe; which how ſucceſsful ſoever it may be, when it is managed by *Dragoons*, yet hath never appeared more naked and deſpicable, than it hath done of late years. Therefore they have given this new *Air* and Turn to the common Subjects of the Authority of the Church, and of Tradition, and have betaken themſelves to the certainty of Oral Tradition, as their laſt retrenchment; and after all thoſe Declamations that have been made of late, againſt thoſe who pretended not to carry the aſſurance of our Religion beyond a moral certainty, they now fly to a Plea, which if it were true, is but at moſt a moral certainty; but is ſo far from being true, that we have as much certainty as we can have for a negative Propoſition, that it is and ever muſt be falſe.

The Author of this Treatiſe offers us a new Eſſay of one of theſe late Methods; for inſtead of attacking our Reformation in any of its eſſential Parts, he goes about only to prove that it was not Canonical; and all this, when it were granted to be true, amounts to no more than this, that the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome* having been extreamly advantageous to the Clergy, the greater part of them were too much locked up in Ignorance, and too much addicted to their Intereſts to admit of any change; and that therefore the leſſer part was forced to make uſe of the Civil-power to ſupport them in reforming thoſe Abuſes. But this muſt be acknowledged to be lawful; otherwiſe all National-Reformations from received Errors, are no more to be thought on. For, ſuppoſe an Error hath overſpread a Na-

a National Church, which is a Suppoſition that none can deny, ſince how infallible ſoever the Catholick Church may be ſuppoſed to be, it is paſt diſpute, that every particular Church may be ſo over-run with Errors, that the greater part may be infected; and if this falls to be in a Conjuncture, in which a General Council cannot be called; and if the Hereſy is new, ſuch, as for inſtance the *Pelagian* was, when it firſt appeared; ſo that it had ſpread far before it had been condemned by a General Council; what muſt be done in ſuch a caſe, if the Prince may not ſupport the Sounder, tho the Leſſer Part? So that according to this Suppoſition, if thoſe Doctrines and Forms of Worſhip that were reformed in the laſt Age, were Erroneous or Idolatrous, than any ſuppoſed Irregularities that might be in the way of managing it, can never blemiſh that Work. It is certain, that all Rules are only for quiet times; in the days of Peace and Order, the tranſgreſſing of eſtabliſhed Rules, is without doubt a very cenſurable thing; but this muſt not be applied to all times. For, tho in a ſetled time we know how much reſpect we owe to Judges and Miniſters of State; yet if theſe very Perſons will go to ſet on a Rebellion, and authorize it, all that reſpect ought preſently to be thrown off.

CHAP. II.

Some general Conſiderations upon what is alledged of the uncanonical Proceedings in the Progreſs of our Reformation.

IT hath a very ill Grace to ſee a man of the *Roman* Communion talk ſo highly of the Obligation to obey the Canons of the Church, ſo as almoſt to *Unchurch us*, upon ſome

ſome ſuppoſed Irregularities in our *Reformation.* For what is the whole Conſtitution of the *Papacy*, but one continued Contradiction to all the *Ancient Canons*? And what is the whole modern *Canon Law*, but the Exaltation of the Papal Authority, above all the Canons of the Church? Is there any thing clearer in the Primitive times, than the eſtabliſhing the Authority of Metropolitans, that was confirmed by the Council of *Nice*; the equalling the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* to the Biſhops of *Rome*, which was done by the 2*d* and 4*th* General Council; the eſtabliſhing the *Independency* of thoſe Churches that were in Poſſeſſion of it, and ſo freeing them from all Subordination to other Sees, which was done by the 3*d General Council*? And yet, tho here we ſee the four firſt General Councils, all concurring to eſtabliſh this form of Government, the Papal-power is no other than a breaking in upon all theſe Canons. What is more uncanonical than the eſtabliſhing *Legatine Courts*, the receiving of *Appeals*, the obliging of Biſhops to ſue for their *Bulls* in the Court of *Rome*; the diſpenſing with all the Canons of the Church, the exempting all the Regulars from Obedience to their Biſhops, which is not only contrary to the expreſs Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, but is plainly contrary to that Authority that Biſhops derive from Chriſt to govern the Flocks committed to their care. In ſhort, the whole Syſtem of the Church and Court of *Rome*, is ſo direct a revolt from all the Primitive Canons, that it is a degree of Confidence, which I do not envy in our Author, for him to talk of uncanonical Proceedings.

Canons are Rules eſtabliſhed, either by Provincial Synods, or more General Councils, which import no more but that they ought to be commonly obſerved; for it is plain, that there is no Church in the World, that hath looked on the Canons of the former times, as things ſo ſa-

cred and unalterable; that they could never be diſpenſed with. The Schiſm of the two Popes at *Rome* and *Avignon*, and all that was done in conſequence of it, was uncanonical with a Witneſs; and yet how was all that buried by the Council of *Conſtance*? And tho one of the two Obediences was certainly in a ſtate of Schiſm, yet all that was paſſed over, and without any Submiſſion of either ſide, all was healed up.

The whole Conſtitution of Metropolitans with their Provincial Synods, which was the ancienteſt and cleareſt of all the Primitive Rules, ariſes only out of the ſeveral Diviſions of the Provinces of the *Roman* Empire; when then the Civil Conſtitution of all *Europe* is ſo much altered from what it was then; all that Fabrick ſubſiſts now rather upon a reſpect to ancient Rules, than from the Authority of thoſe Canons, which can no more remain, the ground upon which they were built, being now removed. And one may as well pretend that we are bound to obey the old *Roman* Law, or the Feudal Law, becauſe thoſe Laws were once received amongſt us; as to tell us, that we are bound to obey all the ancient Canons, eſpecially thoſe that had a viſible Relation to the Conſtitution of the *Roman* Empire. Therefore the Subordination of Churches, of Synods, and Metropolitans, and Patriarchs, that was only the knitting into one Body, and under ſeveral degrees of Subordination, a Church that was all under one Civil Society and Empire, hath ſunk with the *Roman* Empire. So that the tearing that Empire in pieces, hath quite put an end to all that Eccleſiaſtical Subordination. And if there is any thing of that yet kept up amongſt us, it is rather for the preſerving of Order, than that we are under any Obligation of Conſcience to ſubmit to ſuch Conſtitutions. And therefore, as oft as a great Conjuncture of Affairs carries along with it conſiderations that are of more weight, than the adhering

ing

ing to ancient Forms, then all theſe may be well ſuperſeded. For all Rules are temporary things, and made according to ſeveral Emergences and Occaſions, which altering frequently, it were a very unreaſonable thing to expect that every Church ſhould at all times conform it ſelf to them. And tho we condemn that Diſſolution of all the Canons which the Church and Court of *Rome* hath brought into the World, yet on the other hand we cannot acknowledg any ſuch binding Authority in them, that they can never be diſpenſed with.

The methods of thoſe men with whom we deal, are wonderful. Now they reproach our Church with a Violation of ancient Canons; and yet when we lay to their charge ſome of the Canons that their Councils have made in theſe later Ages, ſuch as thoſe of the *Lateran*, for the *Extirpation* of *Hereticks*, and for the Pope's power of *depoſing Heretical Princes*; they tell us, that great difference is to be made between the Deciſions of the Church in the Points of Faith, and the Decrees that are made in matter of Diſcipline; ſince, tho they aſſert an Infallibility in the one, yet the other are tranſient things, in which we ought not to admit of ſo abſolute an Authority. This is falſe with relation to Decrees, that declare a Chriſtians Duty, or a Rule of Morality: For Decrees in ſuch matter do import an Article of Faith or Doctrine upon which they are founded. And therefore a Church may indeed, even in the Opinion of thoſe who believe her Infallible, err in a particular Judgment againſt ſuch or ſuch a Heretical Prince; for that being founded on a matter of Fact, ſhe may be Infallible ſtill, even tho ſhe were ſurpriſed in matters of Fact. But ſhe cannot be Infallible, if in declaring the Duty of Subjects towards Heretical Princes, or of the Popes Authority in thoſe caſes, ſhe hath ſet Rules contrary to the Word of God. In ſuch matters as theſe are, I do acknowledg the Decrees of the Church are for ever Obligatory upon all

thoſe who believe her Infallible. Therefore, ſince our Author urges ſo much the Authority of the Canons, I would gladly know what he thinks of theſe, which are not, I confeſs, *Ancient*, yet they were enacted by the Supream Authority of that Body which they account Infallible. It is true, ſome have thought they could get out of this difficulty by denying theſe to be the Acts of that Council. But if our Author be the ſame Perſon with him that writ concerning the Adoration of the Euchariſt, he is of another mind, and doth acknowledg, that *thoſe Canons are the true Acts of that great Aſſembly, and not only the Deſigns of the Pope.* It is true, he ſaith, the ſenſe of the Canon concerning the ſecular Powers, is by Proteſtants miſtaken. But he hath not yet given himſelf the trouble of laying before us the true ſenſe of that Canon; and one would think that he who writ the Treatiſe that is now under Examination, had very favourable thoughts of the Doctrine of Subjects ſhaking off an heretical Prince; for he reckons up the *many riſings that were in K.* Edwards *days, chiefly for matter of Religion*, as a proof that the Body of the Clergy went not into that change. *Which riſing* (ſaith he) *of the Laity in ſuch numbers for their former way of Religion, would not have been, had not their Clergy juſtified it unto them. Riſing* is a ſoft word for *Rebellion*, and one would think, that it would have afforded no ſmall matter of reproach againſt us, if we brought in a company of Rebels to make up a Muſter of our Religion. But to own that *the Clergy juſtified it to them*, without adding the leaſt Word expreſſing our Author's diſlike of this, ſhews plainly enough, that how good a Subject ſoever our Author may be to a Prince of his own Religion, yet he thinks a Catholick *Clergy may be able to juſtifie to the Laity, a Riſing* againſt a Heretical Prince upon the account of Religion. And it ſeems our Author had a great mind to make a huge appearance of his Catholick Rebels

Adorat of the Euchar. p. 28.

P. 139.

in

in K. *Edwards* days. For, beſides that he ſpeaks of Riſings in many more Counties then are mentioned by the Books of that time; he alſo repreſents all thoſe Riſings to have been upon the account of Religion; tho the Hiſtory makes it clear that the Riſings over *England*, were chiefly occaſioned by Parks and Encloſures, and that it was a rage of the Peaſants againſt the Gentry in moſt places; chiefly in the *Northfolk*-Rebellion, where Religion was not at all pretended; nor doth it appear that any pretended Religion, except thoſe of *Devonſhire*; ſo that our Author would make his Party and the Clergy more Rebellious than indeed they were. In this whole Period he ſeems to have been forſaken of common Senſe.

CHAP. III.

Some general Conſiderations on the Regal Supremacy, that was raiſed ſo high at the Reformation.

OUR Author hath brought together many Acts of Parliament with their pompous Preambles, that ſeem to carry the Kings Power in Eccleſiaſtical Matters to a very Indefinite degree, and upon all this he triumphs often, as if this was ſo improper, that it alone is enough to blaſt the whole Reformation.

Our Author is much more concerned to juſtifie all Papal Bulls, than we can be to juſtifie all the Words of our Laws; eſpecially, the Rhetorick that is in their Preambles. If he believes the Pope infallible, the general Parts of Bulls that ſet forth the Doctrine of the Church, are ſuch ſolemn Declarations, that he muſt be determined by them. But at loweſt he believes the Popes to be the Centers of the Catholick

tholick Unity, and all Biſhops are bound by Oath to obey all their Decrees and Ordinances. Now, when our Author will undertake to juſtifie all the Preambles of Bulls that are in the *Bullarium*, then we may undertake to juſtifie all the flouriſhes that may be in any Act of Parliament.

When any Authority is aſſerted in general and indefinite Terms, theſe are always to be underſtood with thoſe Reſtrictions and Limitations that the nature of things require, to be ſuppoſed even when they are not expreſſed. St. *Paul* expreſſes the Obedience of Wives to their Husbands in terms ſo extreamly extended, that as *the Church is ſubject unto Chriſt, ſo ought the Wives be to their own Husbands in every thing.* He expreſſes alſo the Duty of Children in as comprehenſive terms. *Children obey your Parents in all things.* Now if one would draw Inferences from the extent of theſe words, he might, taking the liberty that our Author takes upon ſome of the Expreſſions that are in our Acts of Parliament, repreſent the Authority that St. *Paul* veſts both in Husbands and Parents, as a very boundleſs, and a very extravagant thing. This is enough to ſhew that in all thoſe large Phraſes of Obedience, there are ſome neceſſary Reſerves and Exceptions to be underſtood; and if this Qualification is neceſſary, even in writings that were inſpired, it is no wonder if ſome of the Rhetorick of our Acts of Parliament wants a little of this Correction.

Ephes. 5. 24.

Col. 3. 20.

It is a very unreaſonable thing to urge ſome general Expreſſions, or ſome ſtretches of the Royal Supremacy, and not to conſider that more ſtrict Explanation that was made of it, both in K. *Henry* the 8*th's* time, and under Q. *Elizabeth*; That were ſo clear, that if we had to do with Men that had not reſolved before-hand not to be ſatisfied, one would think there could be no room for any further cavilling. In K. *Henry's* time, the extent of the Kings Supremacy was defined in the *neceſſary Erudition of a Chriſtian man*,

man, that was ſet forth as the Standard of the Doctrine of that time; and it was upon this that all people were obliged to take their meaſures, and not upon ſome Expreſſions either in Acts of Parliament, or Acts of the Convocation, nor upon ſome ſtretches of the Kings Juriſdiction. In this then it is plainly ſaid, That with relation to the Clergy, the King is *to overſee them, and to cauſe that they execute their Paſtoral Office truly and faithfully, and eſpecially in thoſe Points, which by Chriſt and his Apoſtles was committed to them*: And to this it is added, *That Biſhops and Prieſts are bound to obey all the Kings Laws, not being contrary to the Laws of God.* So that here is expreſſed that neceſſary Reſerve upon their Obedience, it being provided, that they were only bound to obey, *when the Laws were not contrary to the Laws of God.* The other Reſerve is alſo made of *all that Authority which was committed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, to the Biſhops and Prieſts*; and we are not aſhamed to own it freely, that we ſee no other Reſerves upon our obedience to the King beſides theſe: So that theſe being here ſpecified, there was an unexceptionable Declaration made of the Extent of the Kings Supremacy; yet becauſe the term, *Head of the Church*, had ſomething in it that ſeemed harſh, there was yet a more expreſs Declaration made of this matter, under Q. *Elizabeth*, of which indeed our Author hath taken notice; tho I do not find he takes notice of the former, which he ought to have done, if he had intended to have repreſented this matter ſincerely to the world, (which I confeſs ſeems not to have troubled him much.) The Explanation made by Q. *Eliz.* is ſo expreſs, that even our Author cannot find any advantage againſt the Words themſelves, but acknowledges that they are ſuch general Terms, that the Article it ſelf may be ſubſcribed by all ſides. Since then the declared Senſe of thoſe general and extended expreſſions that are

Page 87, 88.

in

in ſome Acts of Parliament, is ſuch, that there lies no juſt Exception againſt it; and ſince this Senſe was not only given by Q. *Eliz.* who allowed ſuch as took the Oath to declare that they took it in that ſenſe; but it was afterwards enacted both in Convocation and in Parliament, and put into the Body of our Confeſſion of Faith. This Explanation muſt be conſidered as the true meaſure of the Kings Supremacy; and the wide expreſſions in the former Laws muſt be underſtood to be reſtrained by this; ſince poſterior Laws derogate from thoſe that were at firſt made. So that according to all this, the Kings Supremacy doth not *give to our Princes the miniſtring either of Gods Word, or of the Sacraments.*—*But that only Prerogative, which we ſee to have been given always to all Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himſelf; that is, That they ſhould rule all Eſtates and Degrees committed to their Charge by God, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal, and reſtrain with the Civil Sword the ſtubborn and the evil-doers.* This is all that Supremacy which we are bound in conſcience to own; and if the Letter of the Law, or the ſtretches of that in the Adminiſtration of it, have carried this further, we are not at all concerned in it: But in caſe any ſuch thing were made out, it could amount to no more than this, That the Civil Power had made ſome Encroachments on Eccleſiaſtical Authority; but the ſubmitting to an Oppreſſion, and the bearing it till ſome better times may deliver us from it, is no Argument againſt our Church; on the contrary, it is a proof of our Temper and Patience, and of that Reſpect we pay to that Civil Authority which God hath ſet over us, even when we think that it paſſeth its bounds. But all that we are bound to acknowledg in the Kings Supremacy, is ſo well limited, that our Author hath nothing to object to it.

Our men of the *Miſſion* have always made a great noiſe of

of the Kings Supremacy, as if it were the moſt abſurd thing that can be imagined; without conſidering, that as the Supremacy is explained by the Article of our Church, it is practiced by almoſt all the States and Princes of *Europe*: It hath been clearly made out by many of our Writers, that the Kings of *England* before the Reformation, were in poſſeſſion of this Supremacy, and that they really exerciſed it, even before they pretended ſo formally to it. I will not enter into this Enquiry, which is ſo well laid open by Sir *Roger Twiſden*, that a man muſt have a great ſtock of Confidence to deny it, after he hath read him. In *France* all Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes are carried before the Courts of Parliament by Appeals from the Eccleſiaſtical Courts, and are finally judged there: Now the Supremacy is always where the laſt Appeal lies, and we may ſee both in *Godeau*, and many other modern Writers, how much they complain of this as a ſervitude under which their Church is brought, and as an infraction of all the Ancient Canons. The Court of Parliament at *Paris* examines all the Bulls that come from *Rome*, and condemns and tears them as oft as they ſee cauſe: So that tho all the Biſhops of *France* are bound by Oath to obey all the Popes Decrees and Ordinances, yet this can take no effect till the Parliament hath confirmed them. How eaſie were it to carry this matter far, and to ſhew that by this, the Popes Power, either as he is St. *Peter's* Succeſſor, and thereby veſted with a Univerſal Authority over the Flock of Chriſt, or as he is the Patriarch of the *Weſt*, and the Center of the Catholick Unity, is ſubjected to the Judgment of a Secular Court, who will not ſuffer the Sheep to hear his voice, till they have firſt examined it. And what is the whole *Concordat*, but a bargain made between the Popes, and the Crown of *France*, to divide the ſpoils of that Church and its Liberties between them; for whereas the *Pragmatick Sanction*

had eſtabliſhed the Clergy in the Poſſeſſion of its Ancient Rites, *Lewis* the 11*th*, and after him *Francis* the 1*ſt*, ſaw well how much this leſſened that unbounded degree, to which they intended to carry their Authority, and therefore they conſented to give the Popes their ſhare, ſo they would warrant their enſlaving that Church. It is known what Complaints, and what oppoſition the *French* Clergy have made upon this matter; yet at laſt they bear it, and ſubmit to it; ſo that here the laſt Appeal, the Check upon the Papal Authority, and the nomination of all the Biſhops and Abbots of *France*, are wholly in the Civil Courts and in the King. If it is ſaid, that in ſome particulars the Supremacy of our Kings goes further; tho that were acknowledged to be true, yet ſince the *more* or the *leſs* does not alter the nature of things, it muſt be confeſſed, that according to our Author's Principles, the whole *Gallican* Church is in an Uncanonical State as well as we are: But tho they do not ſtick to confeſs, that they are in a ſtate of oppreſſion by reaſon of the *Concordat*, and of the unbounded Authority of their Parliaments, yet they do not think that this makes them irregular or uncanonical as to the Conſtitution of their Church.

I might upon this likewiſe ſhew how not only the Republick of *Venice*, but even the Crown of *Spain*, notwithſtanding all its Bigotry, exerciſes ſtill ſo great a Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, that there is only ſome difference of degrees between that which belongs to the Crown of *England* by Law, and that which is practiced elſewhere. The Court of the Monarchy in *Cicily* is well known, in which by virtue of a forged Bull (which is made out to be a Forgery beyond all contradiction) that declares the Kings of *Cicily* the Popes Vicars; there is a Lay-man that is the Kings Vicar-General, who is the Judg of that Court, and to whom all Spiritual Cauſes are brought, and who judges

judges them all, as a ſpiritual Perſon, and that hath the Titles and outward Reſpect that is given to the Pope, likewiſe paid to him. This is the carrying an Impoſture very far; yet, ſince it is done in the Virtue of a pretended Bull, which the Crown of *Spain* will ſtill maintain to be a true one; none hath ever oppoſed this to ſuch a degree, as to pretend that the whole Clergy of *Sicily* are become irregular, becauſe they ſubmit to this Court, and appear before it. So that upon the whole matter, If the great and unmeaſured Extent of the Papal Authority, made our Princes judg it neceſſary to ſecure themſelves from thoſe Invaſions, by ſtretching their Juriſdiction a little too much; on the other hand, thoſe who have ſubmitted ſo tamely to the one, have no reaſon to reproach us for bearing the other Servitude; even, ſuppoſing that we granted that to be the Caſe. And if in the time of our Reformation, ſome of our Biſhops, or other Writers have carried the Royal Supremacy too far, either in Acts of Convocation, or in their Writings, as thoſe things are perſonal Matters, in which we are not at all concerned, who do not pretend to aſſert an Infallibility in our Church; ſo their exceſs in this, was a thing ſo natural, that we have all poſſible reaſon to excuſe it, or at leaſt to cenſure it very gently. For as all Parties and Perſons are carried by a Bias very common to Mankind, to magnify that Authority which favours and ſupports them; ſo the extreams of the Papal Tyranny, and the Eccleſiaſtical Power that had formerly prevailed, might have carried them a little too far into the oppoſite Extream, of raiſing the Civil Power too high.

But after all we find, that when *Theodoſius* came to the Empire, he ſaw the *Eaſtern* half of it over-run with *Arrianiſm*; and as the *Arrians* were in Poſſeſſion, and were the more numerous; ſo they had Synods of Biſhops that had met oft, and in vaſt numbers, and had judged in their favours.

vours. Their Synods were both more numerous than that of *Nice*, and were a more juſt Repreſentative of the Catholick Church, ſince there were very few of the *Weſtern* Biſhops in that which was held at *Nice*. And as for the Frauds and Violences that were put in practice to carry Matters in thoſe Synods, it is very like the *Arrians* both denied them, and were not wanting to recriminate on the Orthodox. So when there was a pretence of General Councils on both hands; here was a very perplexed Caſe. But *Theodoſius* found a ſhort way to get out of it; and therefore, inſtead of calling a new General Council, or of examining the Hiſtory of the ſeveral pretended Councils, which ought to have been done according to our Authors Syſtem; he paſs'd a Law, which is the firſt Law in *Juſtinians Code*, by which he required all Perſons to profeſs that Faith which was profeſs'd by *Damaſus* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Peter* Biſhop of *Alexandria*; and yet this Law which was a higher Invaſion on the Eccleſiaſtical Authority, than any that was committed in our Reformation, was never ſo much as cenſured; on the contrary, *Theodoſius* was highly magnified for it. There is no reaſon to imagine, that he paid any particular Reſpect to the See of *Rome* in this; for his joining *Peter* of *Alexandria* with *Damaſus*, ſhews that he made the *Faith* of theſe Biſhops the meaſures of that Doctrine which he reſolved to protect, not becauſe of the Authority of their *Sees*, but becauſe he believed their *Faith* was Orthodox. The Caſe was almoſt the ſame in *England*, in which it was pretended that the Independent Authority of our Metropolitans ought to be aſſerted, which was eſtabliſhed by the Council of *Nice*; and that many Corruptions in the Worſhip, as for inſtance, the Worſhip of Images that was condemned by two very numerous General Councils, one in the *Eaſt* at *Conſtantinople*, and another in the *Weſt* at *Francfort*, ought to be reformed. If upon all this the Supreme Civil

Civil Authority of this Nation, had enacted ſuch a Law as *Theodoſius* had done, commanding all to follow the Doctrine profeſs'd by the two Arch-Biſhops of this Church, it had been no other, but a copying after that Pattern, which *Theodoſius* had ſet us with the Approbation of all Antiquity; and yet it cannot be pretended, that our Kings and Parliament acted in ſo ſummary a way; For they went much more ſlowly and maturely to Work.

Upon the whole matter, the Civil Authority hath a Power to command every thing that is juſt and lawful; and in that Caſe, the Laws that flow from it ought to be obeyed. And if the matter of the Laws is ſinful, we muſt not indeed obey in that caſe, but we muſt ſubmit and bear what we do not like, and ſuffer where we cannot obey. So that lawful or unlawful ſeem to be the only meaſures that ought to govern our Obedience. And as in the matters of natural Religion and Morality, no Body can deny that the Civil Authority hath a full Scope, tho that is ſtill limitted by this, that there ought to be no Injuſtice, Immorality, or Turpitude in the Actions that are commanded; but where this is not, we are bound to obey all the Laws that relate to thoſe matters; and where it is, we are bound to ſubmit and to bear our burden, without giving our ſelves the trouble to enquire, how far the Civil Authority ought to be carried in ſuch matters. We ſet the ſame meaſures to our Obedience in matters of revealed Religion. If the King paſſes Laws contrary to Scripture, we cannot indeed obey them, becauſe of that higher Authority to which we are ſubject, and in Obedience to which we pay all Submiſſion to thoſe who God hath ſet over us; but if they are lawful, and conform to the Scripture, we ought to obey them without examining, whether the King hath proceeded in the paſſing ſuch Laws by the Rules that become quiet and regular Times. And if a *Hezekiah* or a *Joſias* ſhould riſe up, and finding

finding the greater part of his Subjects, the Priests as well as the People, engaged in Idolatry; if he should reform them, and suppress that corrupt way of Worship, we ought instead of examining critically the method or steps by which he had brought about that change, rather to rejoyce in the goodness of God for blessing us with such a Prince. So that let men men write and dispute as long as they will on these matters, the whole Cause must be brought to this short Issue; Either the things that our Princes and Legislators enacted at the Reformation were in themselves just and good, and necessary, or not; if they were, then they having an Authority over us in all lawful things, as they did well to enact these Laws, so we do well to obey them. But if they were neither just nor good, nor necessary, then we acknowledg, that as it was a Sin in them to enact them, so it were a Sin in us to obey them: And all other reasonings upon this Subject are but Illusions, by which weak minds may perhaps be wrought upon; but they will appear to be such evident Fallacies to men of Sense, that without entring into a strict enquiry of what may be alledged for them, they will easily shake them off.

In short, if the Reformation appears to be a good thing in it self, then all arguing against the manner of it, is but meer trifling; and looks like men, who lie in wait to deceive, and to mislead People by false Colours of Truth.

CHAP. IV.

Reflection on the eight Theses, *laid down by our Author.*

UPon the Grounds that have hitherto been opened, it will not be hard to make a very clear Judgment of all these positions which are laid down as the Foundation of this Work. The

The Firſt is, That *the two principal Offices, which the Clergy have received from Chriſt, are,* (1.) *To determine Controverſies in pure matters of Religion, and to judg what is Truth, and what are Errors, in Faith and Worſhip.* (2.) *To teach and promulgate this Truth, and to execute Church-cenſures on thoſe who receive it not.*

All this is true; but ſince our Author doth not prove that the Clergy are infallible in their Deciſions, which is not ſo much as pretended by any, with relation to National Churches, this only proves, that it is the duty of the Clergy to declare and publiſh the truth; but as the Body of a National Clergy may err, ſo in caſe it ſhould actually err, can it be ſuppoſed that the People and the Prince are bound to err with it? Synods are of great uſe for the Unity of the Church, and a vaſt reſpect is due to their Deciſions; but ſince our Author names the Synods of the *Arrians*, the many Synods that they had, which were very numerous, and were gathered from all parts, gave them all the advantages from this Authority that could be deſired; ſo that if the Council of *Nice* had not had truth of its ſide, I do not ſee why the Viſible Authority ſhould not rather be thought to lye on the *Arrian* ſide. The Princes Authorizing a Synod, or his Oppoſing it, is to be juſtified or condemned from the Deciſions that are made by it; if they are good, he ought to ſupport them; and if they are bad, he ought to oppoſe them; and in this he muſt judg for himſelf, as every other man muſt do, the beſt he can, as knowing that he muſt be judged by God.

The Second is, *That the Clergy cannot make over this Authority to the Secular Governour, being charged by Chriſt to execute it to the end of the World.* Upon which he arraigns Two things; (1.) *The Clergies binding themſelves never to make any Deciſions in matters of Faith or Worſhip, till they had firſt obtained the conſent of the Secular Gover-*

nour. (2.) *The Clergies Authorizing the Secular Governour, or thoſe whom he ſhould nominate to determine thoſe matters in their ſtead.*

It is certain, no Clergy in the World can make any ſuch Deputation; and if any have done it, it was a Perſonal Act of theirs, which was null of it ſelf, and did not indeed bind thoſe who made it, it being of its own nature unlawful, but much leſs can it bind their Succeſſors; but if the Church of *England* never did neither the one nor the other, what a Prevaricator and Falſe Accuſer is he, who as he *lied* long to God and Man, when he pretended to be of this Church, ſo reſolves now to lye concerning this Church as much as ever he did to it? The ſubmiſſion of the Clergy related only to New Canons and Conſtitutions, as the other Act empowering a ſelect number to be nominated by the King to form a Body of a Canon-Law, related only to the matters of the Government of the Church; the Religion and Worſhip had no relation to it; ſo a compromiſe as to matters of Government is very unjuſtly ſtretched, when this is made a ſurrender of the Authority of determining and declaring matters relating to Doctrine and Worſhip, which no Church-man without breach of the moſt ſacred of all Truſts can deliver up; but in the matters of Eccleſiaſtical Policy, all States in the World have felt enough from the Yoke of the Papacy to give them juſt reaſon to aſſure themſelves againſt any more of ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Tyranny; beſides, that in all the engagements tho made in Terms that are general, ſuch as are all Oaths of Obedience; and in particular, thoſe that are made by Prelates to the Popes, exceptions are ſtill underſtood, even when they are not expreſſed: As long then as the Church enjoys a Protection from the Civil Authority, ſhe is bound to make returns of all engagements, not only of Submiſſion, but of Obedience: But tho the one is per-

perpetual, the other has its limits; and when the Church finds its oppreſſions from the Civil Power really to overballance the Protection that ſhe receives from it, in that caſe ſhe muſt reſolve to fall into a ſtate of Perſecution; and all the engagements that any body of the Clergy have made, relating only to the maintaining a peacable Correſpondence with the Civil Powers, they do not at all bind up Church-men from doing their Duty, in caſe the Civil Authority ſets it ſelf to overthrow Religion: Beſides, when both Religion, and the Worſhip, and the Conſtitution of a Church is once eſtabliſhed, the adding new Canons may perhaps be of great uſe to a Church; but yet it cannot be ſuppoſed to be ſo indiſpenſably neceſſary, but that rather than give any diſtaſte to the Soveraign, they may content themſelves with what they have without asking new Canons; and a Church under a Body of Canons may likewiſe reſign up the compiling of theſe into a new Syſtem, and the leaving out ſuch as are found inconſiſtent with the Publick Peace, to ſuch perſons as ſhall be nominated by the Prince; but all this, how general ſoever the words may be, hath ſtill a tacit exception in it, which all that know the Principles of Law will grant.

The Third *Theſis* is, *That the Prince cannot depoſe any of his Clergy, without the conſent of the major part of the Clergy, or their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, and in particular of the Patriarch.*

In this the matter muſt ſtill be reduced to the former Point; Either the Grounds of ſuch a Depoſition are in themſelves juſt, or not; if they are juſt, the Prince may as lawfully hinder any Church-man from corrupting his Subjects, while he is ſupported by a Publick Authority, or a ſetled Revenue, as he may hinder a man that hath the Plague on him, from going about to infect his People; for

for his depoſing ſuch a one is only the taking the Civil Encouragement from him; but when this is done unjuſtly, it is without doubt an act of high Oppreſſion in the Prince; and as for the Perſon Depoſed, and thoſe over whom he was ſet, they are to conſider according to the Rules of Prudence, whether the preſent Caſe is of ſuch importance, that it will ballance the inconveniences of their throwing themſelves into a ſtate of Perſecution; for it is to be confeſſed that Church-men have by their office an indefinite Authority of feeding the Flock, which cannot be diſſolved by any act of the Princes; but the appropriating this to ſuch a Precinct, and the ſupporting it by Civil Encouragements, is a humane thing, and is therefore ſubject to the Soveraign Power. The Princes of *Judah* notwithſtanding an expreſs Law of God which appropriated the Prieſthood, and the High-Prieſthood, to ſuch a Family and Race of men, did turn them oft out;
2 Chron. 17.7. and *Jehoſaphat* ſent to his Princes *to teach in the cities of Judah*; and with them he ſent about alſo *Prieſts and Levites*, who went about and *taught the People*: He did al-
2 Chron 9.5,8. ſo ſet up in *Jeruſalem* a Court made up of *Levites, Prieſts, and the chief of the Fathers of Iſrael, for the judgment of the Lord, and for the controverſies among the people*; and appointed *Amariah* the Chief-Prieſt, to *be over them in the*
V. 11. *matters of the Lord*: *Hezekiah* when he came to Reign, commanded the Prieſts and the *Levites to ſanctifie them-*
2 Chron. 29.5. *ſelves* in order to the reforming the Worſhip, in which he went on, tho a great many of the Prieſts were not very
V. 34. forward in doing it, but he made uſe of thoſe who had ſanctified themſelves; and as he bore with thoſe that did this ſlowly, ſo no doubt he would have turned out any that had been refractory; and finding that the Prieſts could not be ready to keep the Paſſover in
2Chron.30.23. the firſt Month, he with his *Princes, and the whole*

con-

Congregation, put off the Feaſt from the 1*ſt* to the 2*d* Month. Now the diſtinction of days, and the obſervance of thoſe Feſtivities, being ſo great a part of that Religion, and it having been ſo expreſly regulated by the Law of God, that it ſhould be kept on the firſt Month, a Proviſion being made only for ſuch as were *unclean*, or ſuch as were on a *Journey*, that they might keep it on the 2*d Month*; yet here the Civil Authority makes a Law, appointing the Paſſover to be entirely caſt over to the 2*d Month*, becauſe of the Uncleanneſs of ſome of the Prieſts. *Ezra* took a Commiſſion from *Artaxerxes*, impowering him to ſet up *Magiſtrates and Judges, who might judg them that knew the Laws of his God, and teach them who knew them not*; and one of the Puniſhments on the Diſobedient, is *Separation from the Congregation*; to which our Excommunication anſwers. And we ſee what a Reformation *Ezra* made in the virtue of this Commiſſion. *Nehemiah* by virtue of ſuch another Commiſſion, turned out a Prieſt for having married a *ſtrange Woman*. Theſe were all as high ſtretches of the Civil Power, as any that can be objected to our Reformation. But in the next place, it ought to be conſider'd, that, ſuppoſe this turning out of the Clergy had been an illegal and unjuſtifiable thing, yet that doth not ſtrike at the Conſtitution of our Church. The High-Prieſthood among the *Jews* by the Law of God, was ſetled on the eldeſt Branch of the Family of *Aaron*, and it went ſo during the firſt Temple, and likewiſe for ſome conſiderable time under the ſecond Temple; and yet, tho afterwards this ſacred Function came to be ſet to Sale, ſo that Dr. *Lightfoot* hath reckoned up fifty three that purchaſed it for Money, by which prophane Merchandize one might infer, that thoſe Mercenary High-Prieſts were no more to be acknowledged; yet our Saviour, and after him St. *Paul*, owned them to be High-Prieſts. Our Saviour anſwered to *Caiaphas*, when he

Numb. 9. 10.

Ezra 7. 25.

Nehem. 13. 28.

adjured him upon Oath; and it is said by St *John*, that *Caiaphas*, as High-Priest for that year, prophesied. From all which it is clear, that tho these wretched men were guilty of the highest Profanation and Sacrilege possible, yet that was a personal Sin in them; but since they were in Possession of the Dignity, and adhered still to the Law of *Moses*, and performed the Offices of their Function according to his Institution, the solemn yearly Expiation was still made by them, which was the highest Act of the whole Jewish Worship; and they were to be submitted to, and acknowledged as High-Priests by the People, for which our Saviour's practice is an undisputed warrant. Now, if all this was lawful under the *Old Testament*, in which all the smallest parts of that Religion were marked and enacted, much more expresly than they are under the *New*, then it will be a hard performance for any to perswade us, that the Civil Authority may not make such Reformations in the Christian Church, as the Kings of *Judah* did in the Jewish. In this matter, I have not so much as mentioned the Orders and Regulations made by *David* and *Solomon*, tho they are very clear Precedents for justifying all that Supremacy to which our Kings have pretended. But, since I know some have endeavoured to set all this aside, by saying, that they being assisted by immediate Inspirations, acted in those matters not as Kings, but as Prophets. Tho it were easy to shew the falshood of this Allegation; yet, since I would shorten matters all I can, I will not digress into a controverted Point. Under the Protection that the Christian Church received from the Emperors that became Christians, we see that they appointed *Triers* to examine the Matters that were objected to Bishops; and these under *Constantine* judged in *Cicilian*'s Matter upon an Appeal made by the *Donatists*, after it had been already judged in several Synods. *Constantine* did likewise by his own

own Authority put *Euſtathius* out of *Antioch*, *Athanaſius* out of *Alexandria*, and *Paul* out of *Conſtantinople*. It is true, theſe Matters were much complained of, as unjuſt, and as flowing from the falſe Suggeſtions of the *Arrians*: But it is as true, that it was not ſo much as pretended, that the Emperor had no juſt Authority to do it. For the diſputing the Juſtice of the Exerciſe of an Authority, is very different from their diſputing the Authority it ſelf. It was afterwards a common Practice of the Chriſtian Emperors to have a Court of ſome ſelected Biſhops, who waited on them, and to whoſe Cognizance moſt Cauſes relating to Biſhops were left, who acted only by Commiſſion from the Emperor. I have enlarged a little upon this Point, becauſe it ſeemed neceſſary to diſſipate many of thoſe Prejudices, which ariſe out of it.

The *4th* Theſis is, *That a Provincial or National Synod cannot lawfully make Definitions in Matters of Faith, and concerning Hereſies or Abuſes in Gods Service, contrary to the Decrees of former ſuperior Synods, or to the Judgment of the Univerſal Church in the preſent Age, ſhewed in her publick Liturgies.*

This is founded on the Suppoſion of the Infallibility of the Church; ſo if that is not true, then this falls to the ground, and that is not pretended to be proved by our Author, who ſeems only to proceed upon the Subordination that is in the Eccleſiaſtical Body. But if the majority of this Body is not Infallible, then that Obligation to ſubmit to it, muſt be only a matter of Order; and by conſequence, it hath its limits. If this had been the Rule of the Church in *Theodoſius*'s time, how could the ſeveral Provinces have reformed themſelves from *Arrianiſm*, after ſo many General Councils had declared for it, or at leaſt had rejected the word *Conſubſtantial*? but in our condemning the Papal Authority over us, we had both the Council of

Nice for us, that had eſtabliſhed the Independent Authority of the Metropolitans, with the Biſhops of their Province, for all Matters relating to their Province; and the Decree of the Council of *Epheſus*, which appointed all Churches to continue in the Poſſeſſion of that Independence upon any other ſuperior Sees, which was paſt Preſcription. We had likewiſe ſuperior Councils juſtifying us in many of the Branches of our Reformation.

If we muſt ſeek the Senſe of the Univerſal Church in her publick Liturgies, then we have the Liturgies of the *Greek Church* for us in many other Points; and the Corruptions of the Liturgies of the *Roman* Church were ſo groſs, that they themſelves have been aſhamed of a great many of them, and have thrown them out, tho a great many more remain ſtill to be reformed: And if the publick Liturgies are to be conſidered as the Standards of the Senſe of the preſent Church, as no doubt they are, then all thoſe *Expoſitions* and *Repreſentings* that are now obtruded on us, are to be thrown out of Doors, and we muſt ſeek the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in her publick Liturgies.

The 5*th* Theſis, *That a Synod wanting part of a National Clergy unjuſtly depoſed or reſtrained, and conſiſting partly of Perſons unjuſtly introduced, and partly of Perſons who have been firſt threatned with Fines, Impriſonments and Deprivation, in caſe of their Non-conformity to the Prince's Injunctions in matters merely Spiritual; is not to be accounted a lawful National Synod, nor the Acts thereof free and valid.*

All this falls to the ground, if the Reaſons upon which ſuch Perſons were turned out, were juſt. And in that caſe, ſuch Vacancies may be juſtly filled. But it is an impudent thing to found much on this, when the number of thoſe who were turned out, was ſo very inconſiderable,

ble, as it was in K. *Henry*'s, and K. *Edward*'s time; and if ſuch a ſmall terror as the loſs of a Benefice is thought by our Author ſo dreadful a thing, as it may be well judged by the operation it had upon himſelf for 25 years, ſo that this derogates from the freedom of an Aſſembly; then there never was any free, even that at *Nice* not excepted. For it is the ſame fear whether one is threatned with it before ſuch a deciſion is made, or if they knew that it muſt follow upon it: Now this formidable buſineſs of loſing a Benefice, and a baniſhment upon the back of it, was really the caſe of the Council of *Nice*, ſince this was the condition of thoſe who refuſed to ſubſcribe their Definition: So the Principle laid down by our Author, taken from fear, muſt either be falſe, or this will annul all the Eccleſiaſtical Meetings that ever were.

The Sixth *Theſis* is, *That the Judgment of the ſmaller part of the Clergy, even tho the Metropolitan were of that number, cannot be called the Judgment of the Clergy of that Province; and a Prince that follows the Directions of a few of his Clergy, cannot be ſaid to be guided by his Clergy, but to go againſt it.*

This is very true; but yet *Theodoſius* thought fit to give his Sanction to the Faith of two Biſhops, upon which all the *Arrian* Party might have as juſtly ſaid, that he acted againſt his Clergy, for they were then by far the more numerous: The Civil Power is bound to follow thoſe whom they think are in the right; and tho in common matters, and in ſetled times, it is fit to leave things to the majority; yet if it is viſible, that the greater number is both ignorant and corrupt, and that the matters under diſpute are chiefly ſuch things that are of great advantage to the Clergy, both for encreaſing their Wealth, and for advancing their credit, then the Secular Power hath juſt reaſon to be jealous of the greater number of the Clergy, ſince Inte-

Intereſt gives a mighty byaſs, and their following the leſſer number in ſuch a caſe is very juſtifiable; for humanely ſpeaking, it were impoſſible to find the greater number willing to go into ſuch a change.

The Seventh *Theſis* is, *That tho Secular Princes had a deciſive Power in ſuch matters of Faith as are no ways formally determined, yet in ſuch Points as have been formerly determined, no Secular Prince can define any ſuch things contrary to thoſe Councils, or contrary to a National Synod.*

It is not ſo much as pretended, that a Secular Prince hath any Power to decide in matters of Faith, whether they are already determined or not; but as for the giving the Sanction of a Law, and all ſecular encouragements, a Prince muſt have a Judgment of Diſcretion, by which he ought ro determine himſelf; for when he hath given his Sanction, he hath made no ſort of Deciſion in the matter, which is neither more nor leſs to be believed than it was before; but it is now become legal; and all Princes muſt proceed in this matter according to the conviction of their Conſciences: It is not long ſince ſome of this Gentleman's Friends thought to have carried the King of the *Abyſſens* to change the Doctrines and Rites of that Church upon the private ſuggeſtion of a few Miſſionaries, againſt the whole Body of his Clergy, upon which that Kingdom became a Scene of Rebellion and Bloodſhed, till the King himſelf grew to conceive a horror againſt thoſe who had puſh'd him on ſo violently to overthrow the Laws and Eſtabliſh'd Cuſtoms of that Church: So that a Reformation effected by the King's Authority, tho managed with ever ſo much fury and violence, is yet driven on by theſe men, when it is on their ſide, and for their advantage.

Ludolph.

The Eighth *Theſis* is, *That neither National Synod nor Secular Power can make any new Canons concerning the Government of the Church, contrary to the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions*

ſtitutions of former ſuperior Councils, nor reverſe thoſe formerly made by them.

This is ſuch a crude Aſſertion, that one would think that he who made it, knew neither the Hiſtory of Councils, nor the nature of Canons and Conſtitutions, which are all variable, and are made upon ſuch particular occaſions as required them to be put in practice; and another Scene of Affairs may make it as neceſſary to reverſe them, as ever it was to eſtabliſh them: The main ſubject of the Ancient Canons are, Penitentiary Rules relating to the Cenſure of Offenders, the Subordination of Churches founded on the diviſion of the *Roman* Empire, and the Duty and Behaviour of Church-men: Of theſe, the firſt is quite laid aſide in the Church of *Rome*, and by their means we were ſo accuſtomed to be without that Yoke, that we have not been able to bring the World to it. But we have never repealed theſe, only we let them ſleep too long. The Second, relating to the Conſtitution and the Subordination of Churches, is quite ſunk with the fall of the Empire; for if a Town that was the Center of a Province, to which it was eaſie to have recourſe by Letters, and to which the Road and Carriages were regularly laid, and where the Civil Government was alſo exerciſed, ſhould after many ages either be ſeparated from the reſt of the Province, falling under another Maſter, or ſhould become a poor and neglected Town, it is a needleſs adhering to Ancient Cuſtom, to aſſert ſtill the Priviledges of ſuch a See, when all thoſe Reaſons which at firſt procured to it thoſe Priviledges, come to ceaſe: As for the Third, which are more perpetual, we pay them all reſpect, and have never changed them; but the Diſpenſations of the Church of *Rome* hath ſo deſtroyed them all, that it is a peculiar degree of Confidence for any that are in Communion with that Church, to aſſert ſuch an immutability in the

An-

Ancient Canons, that a National Synod may not be ſuffered to alter any of them; and yet that one ſingle Biſhop, whom all Antiquity conſidered but as a Collegue, and Fellow-Biſhop to all the reſt of the Order, ſhould be allowed an Authority to break and diſſolve them all.

This may ſerve to ſhew how weak all thoſe Foundations are upon which our Author builds. I come in the next place to examine his Defective and Falſe Account of the Matters of Fact, which will engage me into a tedious opening of many Particulars that will be little for our Author's Honour; but no Diſcoveries will affect a Man that could ſtifle his Conſcience for 25 Years, and that now hath the Impudence to own it.

FINIS.

REFLECTIONS
ON THE
Oxford Theſes,
Relating to the
ENGLISH REFORMATION.

PART II.

Amſterdam:
Printed for J. S. 1688.

REFLECTIONS
ON THE
Oxford Theſes,
Relating to the
ENGLISH REFORMATION.

IN the former part of theſe *Reflections*, the general grounds on which our Reformation was attacked, were examined; the matters of Fact come now to be conſidered; but before I enter upon theſe alledged by our *Author*, I thought it fitting to begin with an Enquiry into a very important matter, relating to that time, that hath been lately objected to our Church, by one of the Church of *Rome*, which as it is New, ſo it is likewiſe of great Conſequence.

A Sheet has appeared that was well and decently writ, and with a very ſpecious appearance of Reaſon, to prove that Q. *Elizabeth* was a Baſtard, not upon the common pretence of the Nullity of K. *Henry* the Eighth's Marriage with her Mother, becauſe his former Marriage with Q. *Katherine*, was ſtill in force; but upon a Precontract, in which *Ann Bullen* was engaged before her Marriage to K. *Henry*, which being confeſſed by her ſelf, the Mar-

riage was null of it ſelf, and was judged to be ſo by Arch-Biſhop *Cranmer*, whoſe Sentence was confirmed by the Subſequent Parliament. So that here is a Nullity, and by conſequence a Baſtardy. It is true, this Aſſertion is new; ſo, tho it may raiſe the Credit of him that hath diſcovered it, ſince it muſt be confeſſed, that it looks very like good reaſoning; yet on the other hand, it is ſome prejudice againſt it, that it doth not appear it was ever objected to us before now; and no mention being made of it while the whole matter was freſh in Mens memories, and while that Queen reigned, whoſe Title this ſeems to weaken, much more than all the other things that were alledged to ſhake it, is a great Preſumption, that the Men of that time knew there was no force in it. So that, tho the Novelty of it may pleaſe, yet it is really a ſtrong prejudice againſt it. But after all, it muſt be confeſſed, the thing is ſpecious, and it is of great conſequence, not only with Relation to the Credit of our Church, and of its firſt Reformation, but with Relation to our preſent Eſtabliſhment. For tho the Writer of that *Sheet* makes no other uſe of it, but to blemiſh our Church, as guilty of Sedition and Diſloyalty, for owning a Baſtard againſt the Queen of *Scots*, who was the next lawful Heir; yet it will bear another Conſequence that is more important in our preſent Circumſtances. For as a Precontract infers a Nullity of the Marriage, and diſables all the Iſſue of it; ſo an ill Title in a Queen infers a Nullity upon all her Laws, all her Acts of Government, as flowing from an Uſurper; and therefore this ſtrikes not only at the Honour of our Church in the laſt Age, but at its Settlement in the preſent; and I believe this laſt is chiefly aimed at. For, as to the former, it may ſerve in a great meaſure to juſtifie our Church, that Q. *Elizabeth* was put in Poſſeſſion of the Crown by the Nation, while

it

it was yet Popiſh, and by the Body of the Clergy that were of that Religion; ſo that all that thoſe of our Church did, was to maintain her in that Poſſeſſion, in which we found her, and in which our Enemies had put Her. And it muſt be acknowledged, that an anxious weighing of Titles, is not ſo neceſſary, after one is in a legal and peaceable Poſſeſſion, acknowledged by all Parties within the Kingdom, as well as by all Princes without it.

I do not pretend to ſay, That a Poſſeſſion will juſtify a bad Title, tho there is an Older Law relating to the Poſſeſſion of the Crown of *England*, paſſed by King *Henry* the VII. but an undiſputed Poſſeſſion does certainly very much excuſe thoſe who acknowledge and ſubmit to one that is *bonæ fidei Poſſeſſor*. Which was plainly Q. *Elizabeth*'s Caſe. But becauſe it may be with great colour of Reaſon alledged, that Right is Right ſtill, and that Poſſeſſion or Preſcription are only pretences of Law, which may have perhaps weight before a Judg; yet theſe are not ſufficient to extinguiſh a juſt Title, when matters are examined in themſelves, and abſtracted from thoſe Pleadings that may perhaps be legal, yet as ſome will alledg, are ſcarce rational. So I will examine this matter as fairly, as, I muſt confeſs, it is ſtated by that Gentleman, and will firſt propoſe the matter of Fact, as Dr. *Burnet* hath put it, who is the only *Author* that is cited, and therefore he muſt be ſuppoſed to have ſome Credit here.

Queen *Ann Bullen* was attainted of Treaſon upon ſome pretended Proofs of Adultery, and ſo Judgment was given, That ſhe ſhould be *either Burnt* (which is the Death that the Law preſcribes for the Traitors of that Sex) or *Beheaded*. Two days after the Sentence, ſhe is prevail'd on to confeſs a Precontract before Arch-Biſhop *Cranmer*, and

and ſo her Marriage with the *King* is declared void and null, and in conſequence of that the Iſſue is illegitimated; yet this was ſo ſecretly carried, that one of the *Judges* of that time writes of it as a thing that was only reported; and in the ſubſequent *Act* of Parliament, no mention is made of a Precontract, tho no doubt ſhe had confeſſed it with the circumſtances of Time and Perſon. Yet in the Act of Parliament, it is only ſaid, that ſhe had confeſſed ſome juſt and lawful Impediments, by which it was evident, that her Marriage with the King was not valid. It cannot be now known, how this matter was expreſſed in the Sentence given by *Cranmer*, all theſe Records being burnt. But it is moſt probable, that the matter was more diſtinctly ſpecified. Now the only Reaſon we can give of thoſe general Words in the Act of Parliament, is, that this pretended Precontract, being with the Earl of *Northumberland*, he had by a ſolemn Oath, and by his receiving the Sacrament upon it, in the Preſence of the Duke of *Norfolk*, and ſome others of the Privy Council, denied any ſuch Precontract. Of which Dr. *Burnet* aſſures us he ſaw the *Original Atteſtation* under that *Earl*'s own hand. This had ſo far invalidated the *Queens* Confeſſion, that it ſeems the Parliament would not deſcend into the ſpecifying of her Confeſſion. Dr. *Burnet* hath alſo given ſeveral Evidences of her being at that time ſo much diſordered by Vapours, that this doth in a great meaſure weaken the Credit of her Teſtimony, even againſt her ſelf.

Upon this whole matter then, there are three important Conſiderations, which ariſes out of the Fact, and any one of theſe ſeems, ſtrong enough to overthrow all the Inferences that can be drawn from that part of our Story.

She

1. She was a Perſon condemned; now all the Examinations of Perſons condemned, are by the Laws of all Nations, only Preſumptions, but not Proofs; the Terrors of Death, and the Hardſhips of a Priſon, are ſuch juſt abatements, that Confeſſions ſo made, can never have that Credit given them, as to found any Sentence upon them; but in that Queens Caſe, there are two things which give this General Conſideration yet more force as to her particular: The one is, That it being in the King's Power to order her either to be *Burnt* or *Beheaded*, the Terror of the former might carry her to ſay any thing, that might procure her the ſofter Death: But the other was yet ſtronger, it was a natural-enough Temptation to her, to lead her to confeſs a Pre-contract, ſince by that Confeſſion ſhe might hope ſo far to extinguiſh the Crime for which ſhe was condemned, as to obtain her Life by that means: She was condemned for Adultery; now the Confeſſion of a Pre-contract might be drawn from her, as a thing that diſſolved the Marriage, and by conſequence acquitted her of the Adultery for which ſhe was condemned, ſince if ſhe was never the Kings true Wife, ſhe could not be guilty towards him: So that this matter was perhaps repreſented to her, as that which muſt certainly ſave her Life. And thus this Confeſſion being grounded on the fears of Death, and carrying in it the hopes of Life, can be of no force in Law.

2. The bare Confeſſion of a Pre-contract without any other Adminicle or Evidence to confirm it, cannot be ſuppoſed a juſt ground to diſſolve a Marriage; otherwiſe Married Perſons when they grow weary of one another, may diſſolve their Marriage by taking a falſe Oath. It's true, in other caſes the Parties own Confeſſion is ſtrong enough in Law againſt themſelves, but in this caſe both the married Perſons being equally concerned in the Tie that follows upon it,

it, the Confeſſion of the one cannot diſſolve the Right that accrued to the other upon the Marriage; and ſince two Witneſſes are neceſſary in all ſuch Caſes, the Confeſſion of one of the Parties is, at moſt, but the ſingle Evidence of one Witneſs; and therefore *Ann Bullens* Confeſſion could not make the Marriage void: This is further confirmed by the Denial of the Perſon with whom the Pre-contract was pretended to be made; if her Confeſſion gave ſuch a Credit to the matter, as to annul her ſubſequent Marriage with the King, it ought likewiſe to have annulled the Earl of *Northumberland*'s Marriage; therefore it could not be received in Law. The other circumſtances of it do alſo concur to weaken its credit; it was ſo ſecretly carried, that one of the Judges of that time, tells us only that it was reported, that ſhe had confeſſed a Pre-contract; ſo that it was not managed with the neceſſary Forms of Juſtice; and it being probable that ſome General Promiſe of Marriage had paſſed between her and the Earl of *Northumberland*, it is not likely that ſhe underſtood the difference between a Promiſe and a Contract; ſo ſhe might, eſpecially in ſuch a Hurry, and under ſo much diſorder, miſtake the one for the other.

3. But in the laſt place it is to be conſidered, that here was an Innocent Child in the caſe, whoſe Legitimacy and Right could not be cut off by her Mothers extorted Confeſſion; Infants are more particularly under the protection of the Law, and therefore Acts paſſed againſt them in that ſtate of Feebleneſs have ſuch flaws in them, that they have always a right to reverſe them; ſo a ſingle Witneſs in ſuch Circumſtances as her Mothers were, could not be ſufficient to diſgrace and diſinherit her, and the Confirmation of the Act of Parliament that followed afterwards might have been a forcible bar in Law to her, but could be

no

no juſt one; for as a Baſtard is ſtill a Baſtard, even tho he were Legitimated by *Act* of Parliament; ſo a lawful Child is ſtill what 'tis, notwithſtanding a Sentence of Baſtardy confirmed in Parliament; and this is ſo true, and was ſo evidently the Practice of that time, that even King *Henry* in his ſuit of Divorce with Queen *Catherine*, was willing to have his Daughter *Mary* declared Legitimate; becauſe Children begat in a Marriage, are begotten *bona fide*, and ſo they ought not to ſuffer, becauſe of the ſecret fault of their Parents. And if this was yielded in a Marriage where both Parents were according to the Kings Pretenſions guilty of Inceſt, it was much more juſt in this Caſe of *Ann Bullen*, even ſuppoſing her Pre-contract true; for her ſecret fault ought not to blemiſh, nor ruin her innocent Child. Another Inſtance that fell out at this time in the Royal Family, is very conſiderable, and becauſe it is little known, I fancy the Reader will not be diſpleaſed to have it particularly opened to him; *Henry* the 8th's *Siſter* that was *Queen of Scotland*, did after her Husband King *James* the 4*th*'s Death, marry the Earl of *Angus*, and by that Marriage ſhe had a Daughter Lady *Margaret Douglas*. Some time after her Marriage ſhe fell to be in ill terms with her Husband, and diſcovered a Pre-contract he had given to another; and upon this ſhe ſued him in the Spiritual Court; and it being proved, the Marriage was annulled; but her Daughter was ſtill held to be Legitimated, and was entertained by King *Henry*, as his Niece, and given by him in Marriage to the Earl of *Lenox*, of whom deſcended the Lord *Darnly*, that was King *James* the 1*ſt* of *England*'s Father; and ſince he was conſidered to be the Second Perſon in the Succeſſion to the Crown of *England*, after the Queen of *Scots*; this ſhews that by the Practice of that Time, a Pre-contract even legally proved, yet did not illegiti-

mate the Iſſue that were begotten *bona Fide* by one of the Parents.

And thus I hope enough is ſaid to overthrow the Objection that is made to the firſt Conſtitution of our Church under Q *Eliz.*; it was ſtrangely put, and decently and weightily writ, and therefore I have anſwered it with the like Decency of Stile; ſo that if I treat the Author that I am a going to examine, a little more familiarly, I hope the Reader will not impute it to any roughneſs of temper in me; for the examining of Matters of Fact or Arguments from Reaſon, calmly and ſoftly, without any mixture of Sharpneſs, is a thing ſo becoming a man and a Chriſtian, that it is not without ſome Pain to my ſelf, that I find I muſt ſometimes ſay things that ſeem too ſevere: But on the other hand, when one finds he hath to do with much unjuſt malice, he is carried to an Indignation that even forces him to a Style that would appear too flat, if it were not a little ſharpned, when the Provocation is ſo juſt: Yet I am ſo ſenſible that this Smartneſs of Expreſſion is a thing that is rather to be excuſed than juſtified, that I ſhall watch over my ſelf, leſt I be carried too far towards it; for I ſee there is occaſion enough given me by my Author to tempt me to it.

But before I enter upon the matters of Fact, I will take the liberty to ſet down a *Period* of our Author's, which ſhews him as great an Apoſtate from Loyalty to the King, as he is from the other Doctors of the Church of *England*. He ſtates the matter indeed as doubtful; but the bringing of our Allegiance to the King to be diſputable, will be according to our Law, a matter of *Premunire* at leaſt: His Words are, *Whether in caſe that a Prince uſe his Coactive Juriſdiction in Spiritual Matters, againſt the Definitions of the Church, then the Pope hath not alſo virtually ſome temporal Coactive Power againſt the Prince, namely,*

P. 20. lin. 12.

namely, to diſſolve the Princes Coactive Power, or to authorize others to uſe a Coactive Power againſt ſuch a Prince in order to the good of the Church. This they bring in queſtion; but then as this laſt is affirmed by ſome of the Roman *Doctors, ſo it is oppoſed by others of them.* This is in plain Engliſh, that it is diſputable, Whether a Pope may not Depoſe an Heretical Prince, and give his Dominions to another; ſome Doctors of the Church of *Rome* holding the Affirmative, and others the Negative; ſo that according to the Doctrine of Probability, every man may follow the Affirmative with a good Conſcience; and this being ſo invidious a matter, our Author's propoſing it as doubtful, without declaring himſelf againſt it, is a ſtrong, and even a violent preſumption, that he himſelf is for it. And yet theſe men boaſt of their Loyalty.

Our Author inſinuates the Nullity of *Ann Bullens* Marriage, to which I have already given a full Anſwer: But he ſupports it by two Arguments of his own making. (1.) He ſays the *Act* of Parliament (28. *Hen.* 8.) ſays, that the King was conſcious of ſome Impediments why he could not lawfully marry her. From which he ſeems to infer, That the Reports of the Kings Familiarity with her Siſter, were true: But the Act of Parliament mentions only the Queens Confeſſion, and doth not ſay a word of the King's knowing any ſuch Reaſons. (2.) He cites a Clauſe of a Diſpenſation pretended to be granted by *P. Clement* the *7th*, giving him leave to marry again to any Perſon, tho in the firſt Degree of Affinity, and tho ſhe were unlawfully begot; and to make this gain the more Credit, he cites the Words in *Latin*. But there was no ſuch Diſpenſation either asked or granted, and this pretended Diſpenſation was afterwards forged by Q. *Elizabeths* Enemies to defame her. The Bull of Diſpenſation, that the King asked, is ſet down by Dr. *Burnet*, among P. 21.

Hiſt. Reform. P. 1. Rec. Bo. 2. n. 10.

among the Records that he gives us, in which there is no ſuch Clauſe; and it is plain, that whatever the King's ſecret intentions might be with relation to *Ann Bullen*, that yet he had not declared them, much leſs moved to have any ſuch extravagant Clauſe put in the Bull: For in the Letter that the two Legates writ to the Pope, preſſing him to grant the Bull, they reject that Imputation that was caſt on the King, as if he proceeded in this matter out of an averſion to the Queen, or that he was engaged in it by the Charms of the Perſon that he intended to marry, *who, perhaps, was not yet known to him.* This way of Writing ſhews, at leaſt, that it is falſe, that before this time the King had owned his Deſign for *Ann Bullen*, much leſs that he had confeſſed Acts of Leudneſs with her Siſter; otherwiſe it had been too impudent a thing for the Legates to have writ in this ſtrain: So that I had reaſon to ſay, That theſe were Arguments of our Author's making; and in matters of Fact, this is the ſofteſt Word I can find for them.

Ibid n. 24. Nam qui Reginæ odio vel ſperatæ, nec dum forſan notæ, futuræ conjugis illecibris, & titillatione Regem agi putant ij ex cordes plane, & toto, quod aiunt, cœlo errare videntur.

Ibid.

II. Our Author falls into the Common Error of Card. *Woolſey*'s concurring with the King at firſt, in his Suit of Divorce, and becoming afterwards averſe to it, when he diſcovered his Inclinations to *Ann Bullen*; but her two Letters to the Cardinal, printed by Dr. *Burnet*, ſhew manifeſtly the Falſhood of this Imagination.

P. 22.

III. He ſays a 100000 pounds Charges was demanded by the King from the Clergy, for the expence he had been at in obtaining ſo many Inſtruments from the foreign Univerſities, that had decided this matter; and for the Sums that were given, he cites no better Authors, than ſome Teſtimonies produced by *Sanders*. But the falſhood of this Imputation is ſo manifeſt, that it appears by Dr. *Crooks* Letters and Accounts, that are yet extant, that he had ſcarce Money enough allowed him for his own

Cott. Lib. Vit. B. 13.

own Subſiſtence; and as the ſmall preſents he made were inconſiderable, being oft a Crown or two; ſo in a Letter to the King, he writes in theſe Words, *Upon pain of my Head, if the contrary be proved, I never gave any man one half penny, before I had his Concluſion to your Highneſs, without former prayer or promiſe of Reward for the ſame.* By this way of Writing it is plain, that inſtead of his being inſtructed and furniſhed with Money to corrupt Divines, he had poſitive Orders to the contrary; nor is there any mention in the Act of Parliament, that contains the Grant of the Subſidy of any Expence that the King had been at, how boldly ſoever it is aſſerted by our Author. But the citing of an Act of Parliament had an Air of Truth in it, which might deceive an unwary Reader.

IV. He pretends to leſſen the Credit of the Deciſions of the Univerſities, ſince they had ſuppoſed that the firſt Marriage with *P. Arthur* was conſummated; of which he doubts, and propoſes the common Objections againſt it, of *P. Arthur*'s Age, and of his dying ſoon after his Marriage. He alſo ſaith, That tho the firſt Marriage had been conſummated, many Learned Men (of whom he names only *Fiſher* and *Tonſtal*, and takes the reſt on *Sander*'s Words) thought the Pope might diſpence with it; and in Concluſion, he cites the Act of Parliament paſſed in the beginning of Queen *Maries* Reign, condemning her Mothers Divorce, in which mention is made of the Corruption of the Foreign Univerſities. P. 23.

(1.) It is true, all the World believed that the firſt Marriage was conſummated, as appears by what *Cajetan* ſaies upon it: But (2.) ſince our Author cites Lord *Herbert*'s Hiſtory of King *Henry 8th*, he muſt needs have ſeen in him, as clear Proofs of a Conſummation, as a thing of that

that nature is capable of. (3.) Prince *Arthur*'s early Death was generally imputed to his too early Marriage; and the care that was had of the Princeſs after his Death, the delay of giving the Title of Prince of *Wales* to the younger Brother, and the mention made of the Conſummation of that Marriage, dubiouſly indeed in the Bull for the ſecond Marriage, but more poſitively in the ſuſpected Brief, are all as ſtrong Preſumptions, as could be brought, for proving a thing of that nature. (4.) *Tonſtal* concurred with the King in the Divorce, and in all that followed upon it; ſo that our Author had need find better Proofs of this, than *Sander*'s Word, otherwiſe he'l hardly gain Credit. (5.) The Learned Men he mentions, come within a very ſmall compaſs. For as *Cajetan* was the firſt Author of that Opinion, ſo he had very few followers in that Age; tho the conſequences of this Diſpute hath drawn the current of the Authors of the *Roman* Communion ſince that time, to follow his Opinion. (6.) An Act of Parliament made by *Gardner* and others, in the beginning of Queen *Maries* Reign, who were the chief managers of the Suit againſt her Mother, and who by this Act intended to make their Peace, and their Court with her, is indeed a very venerable Authority, and may very fitly come into the ſame Paragraph with *Sanders.*

p. 25. V. He pretends that *Cranmer* and *Cromwell* were the Authors of the Advice of the King's obliging the Clergy in their Submiſſion to own him for the *Supreme Head of the Church.* It is true, he cites *Antiqui Britt.* for this, and for another thing, that whereas the Clergy deſired to have qualified that Title with theſe Words, *In ſo far, as it is lawful by the Law of Chriſt*; the King refuſed this, and the Clergy granted it without that Reſtriction. Here an Author is pretended; but if the Wri-

ter

ter of this Treatiſe had examined theſe matters exactly, he would have found by a Letter of King *Henry*'s to the Convocation of *York*, that the King had accepted of this Limitation; and indeed the nature of things puts it in, whether it had been ſet down in ſo many expreſs Words or not; and as for what is ſaid here of *Cranmer*, it is without ground, for he was then beyond Sea, imployed in diſputing concerning the Divorce. Printed in the *Cabala.*

VI. He ſays, *Warham* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury* was a favourer of Queen *Katherines* Cauſe. This agrees ill with his owning that he ſaw the Lord *Herbert*'s Hiſtory, in which he might have found *Warham*'s Depoſition upon Oath, in which he acknowledges, that he thought the Marriage was neither *honourable*, *nor well-pleaſing to God*, that therefore he had oppoſed it much. And *Warham* did ſet forward the Divorce with ſo much zeal, that he procured a Writing to be ſigned by all the Biſhops of his Province, declaring that they thought that the Kings Marriage was *Unlawful*; and in this he was ſo earneſt, that when *Fiſher* refuſed to Sign it, he preſſed him vehemently unto it; but the other ſaid ſtill, that it was againſt his Conſcience, ſo he made another Perſon ſubſcribe in *Fiſher*'s name, and ſet to his Seal to the Paper, and pretended that he had *Fiſher*'s leave to do it; which he affirmed before the Legates, when the matter came to be examined. So falſe is it, that *Warham* favoured the Marriage. P. 26.

VII. He pretends, that the next ſtep of the Reformation, was the Submiſſion of the Clergy, by which they bound themſelves not to *Aſſemble without the Kings Writ, nor to make or execute any Canons, unleſs the King ſhould by his Royal Grant Command them to make or to execute them.* But the Proof he cites for this, diſcovers his Prevarication evidently. It ſeems he thought a careleſs Reader, P. 28.

Reader, ſeeing an Aſſertion and a Citation following after it, would without reading the long Citation take it for granted, that it agreed with the Aſſertion, and without being at the pains to read it, would run on to new matter. The Clergy did not bind themſelves never to meet without the Kings Writ. They only ſaid, *That the Convocation had ever been, and ought always to be aſſembled by the Kings Writ*, which only ſhews what is the regular Method of their Aſſembling themſelves. But tho this obliges them to meet always, when they are required to do it by the Kings Writ; yet it doth not bind them up from meeting, in eaſe the neceſſities of the Church do require it, and that the King refuſes his Writ; for then they are reduced to theſe prudential Conſiderations in the managing of their matters in a caſe of Perſecution. Nor did they bind themſelves up from executing the old Canons, but only from the enacting of new ones; which is very different from the view that our Author gives of it, as was made out in the firſt Part of theſe Reflections.

P. 39. VIII. He faſtens a very ſtrange Inference on ſome Words of an Act of Parliament, as if they had amounted to this, That no Laws of the Land, nor the Prerogative aſſumed by the King, had any thing of *Hereſy* in them. If by this is only meant, that the Laws then in being were not Heretical, there is nothing extraordinary in ſuch a Pretention. For a Body in which the Legiſlative power reſides, will very naturally aſſert its own Orthodoxy; and the bare aſſerting it, will hardly be thought a Criminal Attempt: But if our Author meant, as probably he did, that by this a Declaration was made for all time coming, that the Laws of the Land ſhould be for ever the Standard of *Hereſy*, or ſound Doctrine; then this Concluſion will hardly be found in the Authority

rity that he gives us for it; which is an Act, declaring, That the ſpeaking againſt thoſe *Laws made by the Authority of the See of* Rome, *by the Policy of Man, which were repugnant to the Laws of the Realm, or the King's Prerogative, ſhould not be judged Hereſy.* This is an Inference worthy of the Sincerity of its Author. In the Body of the Canon-Law, there are many Laws made that deſtroy all Civil-Government whatſoever, and that ſubject Princes wholly to the Pope. There are alſo many Laws made relating to Civil matters, *in Ordine ad Spiritualia*; but all to be ſure for advancing the Intereſts of that Court from which they came. Now the Civil Courts in *England*, were already in Poſſeſſion of giving a check to the Spiritual Courts, and of granting Prohibitions upon their Judgments, even in Caſes of Hereſy, when the Spiritual Courts had judged men Hereticks for *Articles* that were not Hereſy; as *Appeals* lie for the like caſes in *France*; ſo that the Parliament made only a Regulation in this matter, which is at this day practiced in moſt of all the States of *Chriſtendom.* Otherwiſe Civil Government were a very feeble thing, if it could not preſerve its Members from the arbitrary Proceedings of Eccleſiaſtical Courts. And indeed, if the Canons and Rules made by the Popes, and ſuch Synods as were abſolutely at their diſpoſal, were the meaſures of Hereſy, ſo that Judgments ought to paſs upon them, and that States might not cover themſelves from them by Laws; we know where this muſt carry us, and how many Bonfires muſt be quickly made in *England.* But God be thanked, it is not come to that. I muſt alſo add one thing, That if the Judgment of Hereſy

25 Henry 8th n. 14.

had carried with it nothing but the Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures of Excommunications and Anathema's, the Church might have pretended that the State ought not to meddle too much in it. But ſince Hereſy not only drew after it an Infamy in Law, but likewiſe a Writ *de Heretico Comburendo*, according to another *Canon* acknowledged to be in force by our Author; then a State ought to have made ſuch Regulations in this matter, as were neceſſary to protect its Members from ſuch a Butchery. For ſince the Civil Government is bound to ſecure the Subjects, while they continue Innocent and Obedient, from the Rage of all their Enemies; our Legiſlators had betrayed their Truſt, if they had not put an effectual Stop to the Tyranny of the Clergy. And thus it is plain, That this Declaration made by the Parliament, was nothing but a ſecuring to the Subjects their *Lives* and Fortunes, to which they had formerly a very doubtful Tenure, ſince they held them only at the Diſcretion and Mercy of the Clergy.

P. 41. IX. But becauſe our Writers have often alledged the Laws made in former times, chiefly the *Statute* of *Premunire* made by *Richard* the 2*d*, againſt all Bulls and Proviſions from the See of *Rome*; Our Author anſwers this very weightily, as he thinks, by ſhewing us, That thoſe Laws related only to ſome ſpecial matters that were temporal Things; ſuch as the *Titles* to *Benefices*, or the *Tranſlation of Biſhops out of* England, without *the Kings conſent*; by which, both the King might be deprived of their Counſel, and the Treaſure of the Kingdom carried away out of it. But all this is trifling. For a Conteſt being raiſed

raiſed concerning the extent of the Popes Power, the Pope claims a degree of Authority to be committed to him by Chriſt, and that the whole Paſtoral Work belonged to him. Upon this the King and Parliament ſet bounds to it. Now the Queſtion ariſes out of this, Whether the ſame Authority that warranted them to determine againſt the Pretenſions of that Court in that one Point, did not warrant them likewiſe to do it in other Points. To a man of a clear underſtanding, the Matter will appear to be paſt diſpute. For if in one Point a Parliament may contradict the Popes Declarations and Canons, ſure it may do it in another; and the only Queſtion then to be examined, will be concerning the matter of ſuch Laws. For if the matter of thoſe Laws is good, the Authority is certainly good; and if the matter is not good, it is confeſſed that an Act of Parliament cannot change the nature of things.

But becauſe this matter is better underſtood by ſome Breves printed by Dr. *Burnet*, it will be worth the while to examine it a little more fully. That vigorous Act of Parliament came out indeed in the Reign of a feeble Prince, but the Popedom at that time was in a more feeble State; and the adherence of *England* to the Pope, who ſat at *Rome*, was in that time of Schiſm ſo valuable a ſupport, that thoſe at *Rome* (it ſeems) thought it fit to take no notice of it. But the Council of *Conſtance* had no ſooner heal'd that Wound, then the Popes were reſolved to have that Law repealed, and *England* falling again under a new Feebleneſs in *Henry 6th* Minority, and Factions at Home, and Loſſes in *France*,

Hiſt. Reform. Rec. b. 2. n. 37, 38, 39.

France, having ſunk the Reputation of the Government extreamly, the Pope laid hold of that Conjuncture; and in his Letters both to the Arch-Biſhops and Clergy, and to the King and Parliament, he Annuls the Statute, and requires the Clergy to give it no Obedience, declaring all Perſons that obey it, to be *ipſo facto* Excommunicated, and they ſhould not be relaxed by any but himſelf, unleſs it were at the point of Death; and he ordered the Clergy to Preach this Doctrine to all the People. He required the Parliament under pain of Damnation to repeal it, and he founds his right in the Commiſſion that Chriſt gave to St. *Peter* to feed the Flock. Here ſure, if ever, the Pope ſpeaks *Ex Cathedra*; yet for all this, the Parliament would neither repeal nor explain the former Statute. By all which it is plain, that our Parliament did not think themſelves bound to be born down by big Words, and high Pretenſions. In this Diſpute then, between the Spiritual and Temporal Power, we ſee the Parliament judged the matter; and by the ſame right that they judged one Point, they may judg other Points; and if the matter of their Judgment was good, their Judgment was as valid under *Henry* the Eighth, as under *Richard* the Second, or *Henry* the Sixth. For the Point being once yeilded, that the Civil Authority may examine the Deciſions of the Church, then this may be certainly carried to other particulars, or applied to a greater extent of matter, as further diſcoveries of Truth, and new Provocations may ariſe.

P. 51. X. The Affinity of the matter leads me here to make a leap over ſeveral Particulars, which I will afterwards

terwards review, and to examine that which our Author hath thought fit to ſay concerning the burning of Hereticks; only by the way I muſt take notice of the unfaithful Recital that he makes of the two Statutes made againſt Hereticks under *Henry* 4th and *Henry* 5th; which he repreſents as if they had merely left the Judgment of Hereticks to the Ordinary or Dioceſan, without any thing elſe; by which the Repeal of them muſt appear to be the taking away that Judgment from the Spiritual Courts; but there were other and more important Clauſes in thoſe Acts, which gave the Parliament juſt Reaſon to repeal them. In the former, the Civil Magiſtrates are required to be perſonally preſent at the giving of Sentence againſt Hereticks; and after the Sentence was paſſed, they were to receive *them, and there before the People, in a high place to be brent.* Here was the poyſonous Sting in that Act, which our Author was not faithful enough to mention; and in that paſt by *Henry 5th*, all Magiſtrates were required to take an Oath when they entred upon their employments, *That they ſhould uſe their whole Power and Diligence to deſtroy all Hereſies and Errors called* Lollards, *and to aſſiſt the Ordinaries and the Commiſſaries in their Proceedings againſt them; and all convict of* Lollardy *were to forfeit all the Lands that they held in Fee-ſimple, as well as their Goods and Chattels to the King.* Theſe were the true Motives of repealing thoſe Bloody Laws; which our Author ought to have mentioned if he had not deſigned to deceive his Reader; but when he comes to examine the matter of *Burning Hereticks*, he does it ſo ſoftly, that it is plain he would rather lay us aſleep

P. 78, 79. aſleep than quiet us. Firſt he begins with that trifling Anſwer, That the Secular Laws, and not the Eccleſiaſtical, do both appoint and execute it; but if the Secular Arm is threatned by the Eccleſiaſtical, not only with lower Cenſures, but even with Depoſition, and that by a Council, which he acknowledges to be General, in caſe they do not extirpate Hereticks, then this Extirpation is ſtill the Act of the Church, enforced upon the Civil Power with a dreadful Sanction, which the Church was Able to execute in thoſe Ages of Superſtition; and thus the Guilt of all the Blood-ſhed upon the account of Hereſie lies at the Door of that Church. In the next place he reckons up ſeveral Inſtances of ſevere Executions againſt Hereticks both in *England* and elſewhere, which were practiced not only in *Henry* the Eighth's time, but alſo under *Edward* the Sixth's; and were carried on chiefly by *Cranmer's* Authority: Executions made under Queen *Elizabeth* and King *James*, are alſo mentioned; to which is added a Law made by King *James*, adjudging men Traytors for being reconciled to the Pope, or See of *Rome*; *which is putting men to Death for pretended Hereſie, and to a Death worſe than Burning.* But to all this I will only ſay, That the Reformation being a work of time, as men did not all at once throw off all the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, ſo this being the received Doctrine of the *Weſtern* Church for many Ages, that all Hereticks ought to be extirpated; if our Reformers did not, ſo ſoon as were to be wiſhed, throw of this Remnant of Popery, it is rather to be excuſed and pitied in them, than to be juſtified from

their Practice: *Cranmer* did alſo ſoften the Notion of Hereſie as much as he could, by reducing it to a plain and wilful Oppoſition to ſome of the *Articles of the Apoſtles Creed*; and if the conſtant Clamours that the men of the Church of *Rome* raiſed againſt the Reformation, as a Subverſion of the Chriſtian Religion, becauſe ſome that had been among the Reformers, advanced ſome monſtrous Opinions; if theſe, I ſay, carried our Reformers to ſuch a way of juſtifying themſelves of this Imputation by ſome publick Executions, they who gave the occaſion to this ſeverity, which I do not pretend to juſtifie, ought not to reproach us for that to which they *drove* our Anceſtors. As for King *James*'s Law, I will not examine whether the Death of Traitors, or the Burning of Hereticks, is the more dreadful; it is certain, *Fire*, eſpecially when it is ſlow, is the moſt terrible of all deaths, and that which gives the moſt formidable Impreſſion; but if the Provocation given to the King and Parliament at that time *by the Gun-powder Treaſon*, be conſidered, it will not appear ſtrange, if the King and Parliament, after they had eſcaped ſo narrowly the greateſt of all dangers, took a little more than ordinary Care to ſecure themſelves againſt the like Attempts in time coming. And if the ſevere Canons of the Council of *Lateran* againſt Hereticks had lain as ſo many dead Letters in the Body of the Laws of their Church, as that Law hath done in our Book of Statutes, they had had much leſs Blood to anſwer for, and leſs guilt than lies upon them at preſent. After theſe ſoftnings, our Author comes to paſs his own Cenſure on the Burning

ing of Hereticks; but the common Rules of Prudence ſhould have led him in the preſent juncture of Affairs to have condemned it roundly, and ſo to have laid our apprehenſions a little; yet he ſaw ſo plainly, that this was a practiſe ſo clearly authorized both by Law and Cuſtom in their Church, that he durſt not diſown it in expreſs words; and indeed he underſtands ſo little, how a tender point ought to be touch'd, that by all the Rules of Prudence, he ought not to have medled with it. His Diſcourſe in this is an Original; and becauſe I'le do him no wrong in the manner of Repreſenting it, I will ſet it down in his own Words.

"But whether this Law in it ſelf be juſt; and "again, if juſt, whether it may be juſtly extended "to all thoſe ſimple People put to death in Queen "*Maries* days, (ſuch as St. *Auſtin* calls *Hereticis* "*Credentes*) becauſe they had ſo much Obſtinacy, "as not to recant their Errors, for which they "ſaw their former Teachers ſacrifice their Lives, "eſpecially when they were prejudiced by the moſt "common contrary Doctrine and Practice in the "precedent Times of *Edward* the *6th*; and had li-"ved in ſuch a condition of Life, as neither had "means, nor leaſure, nor capacity to examine the "Churches Authority, Councils or Fathers, ordi-"narily ſuch Perſons being only to be reduced "(as they were perverted) by the contrary faſhion "and courſe of the times, and by Example, and "not by Argument, either from Reaſon or from "Authority; (and the ſame that I ſay of theſe "Laity, may perhaps alſo be ſaid of ſome illiterate "Clergy); whether, I ſay, this Law may juſtly be "extended

" extended to ſuch, and the higheſt ſuffering Death " be inflicted (eſpecially where the Delinquents are " ſo numerous) rather than ſome lower Cenſures " of pecuniary Mulcts or Impriſonment, theſe things " I meddle not with, nor would be thought at " all in this place to juſtifie.

Here is a long Period of 208 Words, before the Verb comes to cloſe it; but there is ſmall comfort in all this; for even after our Author hath put the Caſe with all poſſible Abatements, and as ſoft as may be, of the ignorances, the ſtrong prejudices, and the numbers of the Delinquents, and intimated his merciful inclinations only towards the Laity, and ſome of the illiterate Clergy, and that only with relation to Death; Fines and Impriſonments, being left out of the Grace that he would ſhew us; yet in concluſion he only tells us, *He will not meddle with this matter, nor would he be thought at all to juſtifie it in this place; for he is only concerned* what we think of him, and whether he juſtifies it or not; he only tells us he would not be thought to do it; and yet leſt that ſeem too much, he adds a further Qualification, that he would *not be thought to juſtifie it in this place*: So that he hath fully reſerved all his Rights entire to a fitter opportunity, and then he well may, without the leaſt Reproach, juſtifie that in another place, which he doth not think fit to do at preſent: Yet it ſeems he hath a very narrow heart in matters of Grace; for this ſame ſcanty meaſure of Favour that he had clogg'd with ſo many Reſerves, is yet retrenched conſiderably in the following Words.

" Tho ſome among thoſe unlearned Lay-people, " I confeſs to have been extremely arrogant, and " obſtinate, and zealous, beyond knowledg; and " tho they had ſuffered for a good Cauſe, yet ſuf- " fering for it on good or reaſonable grounds, as " neither themſelves, being any way learned, nor " pretending the Authority of any Church, nor re- " lying on any preſent Teachers, but on the cer- " tainty of their own private Judgment, interpret- " ing Scripture as you may ſee. And here ſome Inſtances are given; but if this Period will cloſe it ſelf it may; for our Author, who ſeldom takes care of ſuch ſmall matters, leaves it in this unfiniſhed con dition. I will not examine the truth of this Maxim, but will only take notice, that ſince all Proteſtants agree in this, that the Ground of our Faith is that which appears to us to be the Senſe of the Scripture, our Author hath by this Limitation of his former gentleneſs towards us, delivered us all over to the Secular Arm; and ſo God have Mercy on our Souls, for it is plain he will have none upon our Bodies.

P. 57. XI. He quarrels with the Privy-Council, for impriſoning of *Bonner*, becauſe he ſaid he would obſerve the Injunctions that were ſent him, *if they were not contrary and repugnant to Gods Law, and to the Statute and Ordinance of the Church; the fault imputed here to him, I ſuppoſe, being that he refuſed to obey any Injunctions of the King, when repugnant to the Statute and Ordinance of the Church*: But ſince he had a mind to blacken that time, he might have as well ſaid, that they found fault with him be-

becauſe he promiſed to obey the Injunctions, if they were not contrary to Gods Law; and that thereby it appeared, that they preferred their Injunctions to the Laws of God, as well as to the Laws of the Church; and by our Author's taking no notice of the firſt Branch of *Bonner*'s Exception, it may be inferred, That all his Concern is about the Laws of the Church, and ſo they be ſecured, he troubles himſelf little what becomes of the Law of God: But if he had weighed this matter as he ought to do, he would have found that this Exception is very ill grounded. When a Form of a Subſcription is demanded, there is no Government in the World, that will accept of one that indeed ſignifies nothing at all; for it is viſible, that a Subſcription made with thoſe Reſerves, ſignifies nothing; therefore if *Bonner* had acted as became his Character, he ſhould have directly refuſed the Subſcription of ſuch Injunctions, as he found to be contrary to the Laws of God, or to ſuch Laws of the Church as he thought bound his Conſcience: But the Proteſtation he made, gave a very juſt ground to the Government to proceed againſt him according to Law.

XII. Our Author intending to aggravate the Proceedings againſt *Gardiner*, ſhews his great Judgment in ſetting down the Article relating to the Kings Supremacy at full length, whereas he had only named the others; for he could have invented nothing that muſt needs render all his Exceptions to the King's Supremacy more viſibly unjuſt, than this doth, which is in theſe Words: P. 58.

That his Majeſty as Supreme Head of the Church of England, *hath full Power and Authority to make and ſet forth Laws, Injunctions, and Ordinances concerning Religion and Orders in the ſaid Church, for repreſſing all Errors and Hereſies, and other Enormities and Abuſes; ſo that the ſame Alteration be not contrary or repugnant to the Scriptures or Law of God.* This was no other than what *Gardiner* had over and over again both by his Oaths and his Writings advanced; and the reſtriction ſet on it was ſo juſt, that one would think there lay no poſſible Exception to it. Here there is no claim to the declaring what were *Errors* and *Hereſies*, but only to the repreſſing them; and this is done by the Secular Arm, even where men are burnt for Hereſie: Beſides, the Power, that according to our Author, belongs to the Paſtors of the Church, is either founded on the Scriptures, or it is not; if it is not founded on the Scriptures, there is no great regard to be had to it; but if it is founded on it, then it it clearly excepted by the words of this Article; ſo it is hard to ſee of what uſe this is to our Author, unleſs it be to ſhew him his Injuſtice.

P. 64. XIII. He tells us, That all that which had been done under King *Henry* and King *Edward*, was Annulled by an equal Authority under Queen *Mary*. But tho I acknowledg he was both the Soveraign, and the Parliament; yet there was neither Juſtice nor Moderation in the Charge now made, equal to what had been done before. A great deal might be ſaid concerning the Election of the Members of Parlia-

Parliament, and the Practices upon them, and of the turning out a Multitude of the Clergy before the Laws were changed. The Diſorders and Irregularities in the Diſputes had nothing of that fair Dealing in them that had appeared in King *Edward*'s time; and whereas all the Severity of King *Edward*'s days, was the Impriſoning of three or four Biſhops, and the turning out ſome of the other Clergy; he knows well how matters went under Queen *Mary*. So that we cannot be denied this Glory, that a Spirit of Juſtice and Moderation appear'd at every time that the Reformation prevail'd. Whereas things went much otherwiſe in this ſad Revolution, in which our Author Glories ſo much. So that if the good or ill Behaviours of the ſeveral Parties, as they had their turns in the Adminiſtration of Affairs, furniſhes a juſt Prejudice, even in favour of the Cauſe it ſelf, we have this on our ſide as fully as we can wiſh for.

XIV. He tells us, That the Biſhoprick of *Durham* was firſt kept void in King *Edward*'s days, and laſt of all it was by Act of Parliament *diſſolved to increaſe the Kings Revenue.* If our Author had examined the Records of Parliament, he would have found that the Act that related to the Biſhoprick of *Durham*, did not at all propoſe the Increaſe of the Kings Revenue, but the dividing of one Biſhoprick into two; and the raiſing and endowing of a new Cathedral Church, all which muſt have riſen to about Four thouſand Marks of old Rents, which conſidering how long Lands were let near the Borders, did certainly very near exhauſt the whole P. 68.

whole Revenue of that See. This is indeed of no great Importance to the main Cauſe. For if ſacrilegious Men went into the Reformation, hoping to enrich themſelves by it, this is nothing but what falls out in all great Revolutions. And it is plain our Author took up general Reports very eaſily, that ſo he might make a Clamour with them againſt our Church. But if ſome that gave an outward compliance to the Doctrine of our Church, were really a Reproach to it; he of all Men for a certain Reaſon, ought not to inſiſt on it. Since we are no more accountable for the Duke of *Northumberland*'s Actions, than we are for his own.

P. 71. XV. He tells us, That the Biſhops turned out by Queen *Mary*, were Ejected, becauſe the greater part of them were Married; upon which he gives ſome grounds to juſtifie that Sentence.

I will not here examine the Point of the Unlawfulneſs of the Marriage of the Clergy. It is not ſo much as pretended to be founded on Scripture; and the Diſcipline of the Church hath been, and is to this day very various in that Matter. But this is certain, that a Law being made in King *Edward*'s days allowing the Marriage of the Clergy, the Queen upon the repeal of that Law, granted a Commiſſion to ſome Biſhops to examine four of King *Edward*'s Biſhops, and to try if they were Married, and upon that to deprive them. This was an Act of the Queens Civil Power; ſo that the Deprivation, according to our Author's own Principles, was done by Virtue of that Commiſſion, and

and was by conſequence void. It was alſo moſt unjuſt with Relation to the Civil Power. For theſe Biſhops having been married under the Protection of a Law that warranted it, that Law muſt ſtill juſtifie them for what was paſſed; and the repeal of it, tho it might Impower the Queen to proceed for the future againſt thoſe of the Clergy that ſhould contract Marriage, yet it was againſt all the Rules of Juſtice to deprive them by Virtue of a Commiſſion from the Queen, for an Action that was warranted by a Law then in being. But there was another more extravagant Commiſſion by which three other Biſhops are repreſented as not having behaved themſelves well, and that as the Queen credibly underſtood; they had both Preach'd erroneous Doctrines, and had carried themſelves contrary to the Laws of God, and the practice of the Univerſal Church. And therefore She orders theſe Perſons to proceed againſt them, either according to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, or the Laws of the Land, and declare their Biſhopricks void, *as they were indeed already void.* Now our Author will ſhew his great reading in an inſtance that cannot be diſputed, if he can find a Preſident for ſuch a Commiſſion as this is,. in all Hiſtory, or a Warrant for it, among all thoſe Canons for which he pretends ſo much Reſpect and Zeal. And thus he hath, A Deprivation of ſeven Biſhops done by the Civil Authority, and without ſo much as the Colour of Juſtice.

XVI. The ſecond Reaſon he gives for their Deprivation, was their not acknowledging of any P. ibid.

Supremacy

Supremacy in the *Roman-Patriarch*; and here, as elſewhere, he ſeems to plead for no higher Authority to the Pope, but that of a *Patriarch*. But not to repeat what was ſaid upon this in the general Conſiderations, the acknowledging of that Power in the Pope, would not have ſerved turn. It was never demanded of the Clergy, and would certainly not have been accepted.

P. 72. XVII. Another Reaſon was their refuſing to officiate according to the Liturgies received, and uſed by the whole Catholick Church, for near a 1000 years. There is ſome Modeſty in this Pretenſion, which carries up the Abuſes no higher than a 1000 years. Tho, as to the greater part of them, and the greateſt of them all, which is the Adoration of the Hoſt, there is no juſt claim to the half of that Antiquity. Yet if the Church of *Rome* will give us the firſt 500 years, we will not be much concerned in the 1000 that comes next. Our Author ſpake too wide, when he named the *whole Catholick Church*, he ſhould have ſaid the *Weſtern-Church*, if he would have ſpoke exactly: And for this Pretenſion to a 1000 years, any that will compare the Miſſals that have been printed by *Card. Bona*, and *F. Mabillon*, with the preſent *Roman* Miſſals, will ſoon find that the *Roman* Miſſal of the laſt Age, was far different from what it had been for a 1000 years before. There is one Particular in which indeed they ſeem both to agree, and yet by which the change of the Doctrine of the Church is very conſpicuous in the ſo much diſputed Point concerning the Preſence in the Sacrament. After the

the *5th* Century, that a ſort of an Invocation of Saints was received, by which, tho they were not immediately prayed to, yet Prayers were put up to God to hear us, upon the account of their Interceſſion. There are ſome Prayers in ſome Ancient Miſſals that mention the offering up of that Sacrifice to their Honour, and that pray God to accept of it on the account of their Interceſſion. Now in the Opinion of the Church of *England*, that conſiders the Communion, as a commemorative Sacrifice of the Death of Chriſt, and as a Sacrifice of Praiſe that is offered up to God upon it; theſe Words bear a good Senſe, which is, that to honour the Memory of ſuch Saints, their Holy-days were days of Communion; and this Action is prayed to be accepted of God, on the account of their Interceſſion. In which there is nothing to be blamed, but the Superſtition of praying to God with regard to their Interceſſion. But one ſees a good Senſe in thoſe Collects. Yet theſe very Collects are Nonſenſe, or down-right Blaſphemous in the preſent State of the *Roman* Church, in which the Sacrifice of the Maſs is believed to be the very Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are there offered up, ſo as to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Dead, and the Living. Now to ſay, That this is offered up to the Honour of a Saint, or to Pray that it may be accepted by Virtue of their Interceſſion, is the moſt extravagant and impious thing that can be imagined. So that this change of Doctrine hath rendred the Canon of the Maſs, even in thoſe things for which they can pretend to ſome Antiquity, both Impious and Blaſphemous in the Opi-

nion and Senſe which is now generally received in that Church.

P. 84. XVIII. Our Author cenſures a Clauſe in an Act paſſed in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, in which it is declared, *That in all time coming, Doctrines are to be judged and determined to be Hereſies, by the High Court of Parliament, with the Aſſent of the Clergy in their Convocation*; as if by this the Clergy could not paſs a Judgment of Hereſy, without the Concurrence of the Parliament. But Hereſy being declared a Crime, that inferred a Civil Puniſhment, the Parliament had all poſſible Reaſon to make their own Concurrence neceſſary to a Judgment upon which many Civil Effects were to follow. If the Judgment of Hereſy went no further than Spritual Cenſures, then this Limitation upon the Clergy might be blamed a little. What is this, but what is practiced at preſent in *France*, in which the Cenſure that the preſent *Pope* paſſed in *May* 1679. condemning ſome of the impious Opinions of the modern Caſuiſts, was declared to be of no force, becauſe it flowed from the *Pope* with the Court of the *Inquiſition*, which is not received in that Kingdom. And neither the Bulls of Popes, nor the Decrees of Council are of any force there, but as they are verified in Parliament, tho their Parliaments come far ſhort of the Authority of ours.

P. 90. XIX. Our Author excepts to King *Henry* the Eighth's abrogating thoſe Laws *That were eſtabliſhed by the Authority of the Biſhops of* Rome; *as*

as if this included all thoſe Laws that were paſſed by the Councils, in which Popes preſided; ſince the Canon-Law is compoſed of Synodal, as well as of Pontifical Laws. In this we will freely own to him, that ſince the time that the Popes have ſo far enſlaved the Biſhops, as to make them ſwear Obedience to them, we look upon all the Laws that have been made in Synods, compoſed of men ſo pre-engaged, as *Papal Laws*; but this doth not at all touch thoſe Laws that paſſed before that Authority was claimed. And indeed there never was a groſſer Abuſe put on the World, than the whole *Canon Law.* For, as for the firſt and foundeſt part of it, which is *Gratian's Decree*, it was only a Common-place Book drawn up by a Man that was indeed, conſidering the Age in which he lived, of great Learning and good Judgment. But he was at that time ſo ill furniſhed with all neceſſary helps to make him judg a right of his Matter, that it is an impudent thing in the Ages of more Knowledg, to pretend to keep up the Credit of a Book that was compiled in ſo dark, and ſo corrupt a Time. The reſt is yet worſt, made up of Papal Conſtitutions, or the Decrees of thoſe ignorant and packt Aſſemblies, that had met for the three Ages preceding the Reformation. If King *Henry* had abrogated the Ancient Canons, our Author might have had ſome Colour for his Complaints. But the total abrogating of that courſe Compilation of the Canon-Laws, which never was founded on any good Authority, was ſo juſt a thing, that there are very few Learned Men in the *Roman* Communion at preſent, that will not ſay it were well for the Church if it were quite laid aſide, ſince

now all men but ſuch as our Author are aſhamed of it.

P. 93. XX. Our Author writes as if he intended to do Honour to the Memory of King *Henry*. For he cites theſe Words out of his Preface to his Injunctions; *Which Agreement of the Clergy for as much as we think to have proceeded of a good, right and true Judgment, and to be agreeable to the Laws and Ordinances of God*; He thereupon ordered it to be publiſhed. An ordinary man would be upon this induced to approve mightily of the King's method. Firſt to Authorize the Clergy to examine thoſe Matters, and after that, to review their Determinations himſelf, before he gave his Civil Sanction to them. Would our Author have a Prince rely blindly on a National Clergy, which is ſubject to Error, as is acknowledged by all the World? What Judgment then can he follow but his own? The Civil Power muſt be applied in matters of Religion, as is acknowledged on all hands, upon the Judgment of the Prince. For he can follow no other, even in the Principles of the Church of *Rome*, except when he is determined by an Infallible Court, which is only in a General Council.

P. 99. XXI. Among the other Exorbitances of the King's Supremacy, one reckoned up by our Author is his taking away the Pope's Authority as Patriarch, in confirming the Metropolitan, and his requiring his Clergy, under the pains of *Premunire*, to conſecrate into Biſhopricks any that he ſhall nominate: It is great Ignorance, or ſomewhat worſe

worſe in our Author, if he will pretend that the Authority of the Patriarchs over Metropolitans, was of Primitive Antiquity; for by the Council of *Nice*, every Province was an intire Body within it ſelf; if the Clergy is under ſome ſervitude as to the promoting thoſe nominated by the King, the *Pope* is under the ſame to the King of *France* by the *Concordate*; and our ſubjection in this Point, does not bind our Conſciences, but lies only on our Perſons and Benefices; and therefore when a caſe of Perſecution comes, we muſt reſolve to venture on a *Premunire*, and worſe things too, if we are preſſed hard.

XXII. He adds to this another groſs miſtake in Hiſtory, intimating that the Suppreſſion of Monaſteries was done by virtue of this Supremacy; upon which he runs out into a long deduction of many Particulars relating to that Affair; but this is all ſo falſe, that the Supremacy was not ſo much as once pretended in it; it went all upon Acts of Parliament, and the ſurrenders of the Monks: If the King acted violently and unjuſtly in this matter, it doth not at all concern the Reformation, and much leſs his Supremacy; and as for all the Topicks of Sacriledg and Profanation, and the alienation of Things, and the violation of Perſons (Sacred), theſe are general and dreadful words, which loſe their Horror, when it is conſidered, That the vaſt endowments of Monaſteries were the effects of the Superſtition of thoſe Ages, in which the belief of the Redemption out of Purgatory, by the ſaying of ſo many Maſſes, P. ibid.

to-

together with many falſe Miracles, had prevailed ſo far on the Ignorance and Credulity of the World, as to draw the beſt part of the Wealth of *Europe* into thoſe Houſes; when, I ſay, not only the ſcandalous Lives of many Monks, which were indeed but Perſonal Things, but their falſe Miracles and Relicks, and above all, the falſhood of redeeming men out of Purgatory by their means, were diſcovered, no doubt it was lawful to diſſolve all thoſe Endowments, and to turn their Wealth to better uſes; and if the King did not enough that way, it was ſo much the worſe for him; but that doth not at all blemiſh the Reformation. So that all the long digreſſion he makes upon this Head, is impertinent to the buſineſs in hand, which is the Supremacy.

P. 108. XXIII. He ſays, That the Pope pretends no ſuch Power, as to *alienate the Church-Revenues for to ſpend them himſelf, or to diſpoſe of them in what manner, or to what Perſons he pleaſes; but only for ſome juſt Cauſe, that is, in a prudential Arbitration, for an equal or greater benefit accruing to the Church, or Chriſtianity.* I do not know, if the *D's* of *Parma*, or a great many other Princes, that have been raiſed out of the Patrimony of the Church, would judg this to be good Doctrine; and if the Church is always a *minor*, ſo that the Bargains made in her name may be ever recalled, it would be hard to find what *Benefit hath ariſen to the Church or Chriſtianity*, out of the Robberies that Popes have made to raiſe their Families; and it is a ſtrange piece of Impudence in theſe men, who are always

always reproaching us with what ſome of our Princes did in the time of the Reformation, when all that put together, doth not amount to the Injuſtices that have been committed in one ſingle Pontificate of thoſe whom they would have us look on as God's Truſtees, and as Chriſt's Vicars; if they are not concerned in thoſe who are the Spiritual Heads of their Church, much leſs are we bound to juſtifie all the Actions of thoſe who are only the Civil and Temporal Heads of our Church.

XXIV. He tells us that the *Monks could not* P. 110.
give away that which they had only for term of Life. I know not how this comes to be delivered by our Author, at a time when the ſurrender of ſo many Charters to the King hath been judged Legal, though it was made by men who had no *Title to theſe*, and who were ſo far from having a *Right to them for Term of Life*, that they had only the Adminiſtration of them in an Annual Magiſtracy; ſo that our Author had beſt conſider how he advances ſuch Poſitions, leſt he doth as much hurt one way, as he thinks to do ſervice another. In a word, our Author hath pleaded the Cauſe of the Monaſteries, and hath arraigned the Suppreſſion of them ſeverely, tho as he ſaid concerning the burning of Hereticks, *he would not be thought to plead for it in this place.*

XXV. He accuſes King *Henry* for giving P. 111.
Diſ-

Diſpenſations in matters of Marriage againſt Eccleſiaſtical Canons, and becauſe he declared all Marriages to be lawful, that were not againſt Gods Law: Here, if in any thing, the perverſeneſs of the Church of *Rome* appears, or rather their deſign to oblige the World to have oft recourſe to them, to pay them well, and to depend much on them; they have prohibited Marriage in many degrees, that were not forbid by the Law of God; and to ballance this, they have ſuffered Marriages to be contracted in the Degrees forbid by God; for the Pope's Power of Diſpenſing is promoted both ways; they have added a new Contrivance of Spiritual Kindred; and as the Prohibitions that they have ſet up were unknown to the Ancient Church, ſo the Degrees that they have declared diſpenſable, were believed by the Ancient Church to be moral and indiſpenſable: And yet after all this corruption of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline they are in great wrath at the Reformers, becauſe they thought it was fit to return to the Degrees forbid by the Law of *Moſes*, and to cut off theſe ſuperadded Prohibitions, which were inventions to bring griſt to that Mill, where all things were to be had, ſo men will come up to the Price. There follow here a great many Inſtances, in which King *Henry* exerciſed his Supremacy, which our Author aggravates all he can: But the Conſiderations that were propoſed in the firſt Part, ſeem fully to ſatisfie all the difficulties that can be thought to ariſe out of them.

XXVI. He

XXVI. He tells us, that ſuch of the Privy Coun- P. 119.
cil, as complied not with the Changes made in King *Edward*'s Days, were turned out after ſome time; and names Biſhop *Tonſtal*, *Wriotheſly* the Chancellor, and the Earl of *Arundel*: and he adds, That the King had but one Parliament, continued by Prorogation from Seſſion to Seſſion, till at laſt it ended in the Death of the King. Here are Matters of no great Conſequence, I confeſs: but theſe ſhew how careleſs our Author was in examining the Story of our Reformation: and how eaſy he was to take up any Reports that might blaſt it. It will not appear a very extraordinary thing to ſee Privy Counſellors turned out, that do not concur with the Deſigns that prevail. Some ſuch things have poſſibly fallen out in our own Time; and Men have no great cauſe to complain of a ſevere Adminiſtration, when this is all the Rigour that is ſhewed to thoſe who oppoſe themſelves to the *Tide*. But our Author was miſinformed in all theſe Particulars. *Tonſtal* went along with all that was done, and was contented to proteſt in Parliament againſt ſome Laws; but as ſoon as they were made, he gave a ready Obedience to them; and continued to be ſtill in the Council, during the Duke of *Somerſet*'s Miniſtry. *Wriotheſly* was not turned out till after ſome time; but immediately upon King *Henry*'s Death, he had paſt an illegal Patent, upon which to prevent a ſeverer Sentence, he reſign'd his Place; but he continued ſtill to be of the Privy Council. And the Earl of *Arundel* continued to be of the Privy Council for many Years, and long after fell to be in ill

terms with the Duke of *Northumberland*; and upon that an Enquiry was made into his Adminiſtration, and he was fined 12000 Pounds. But it is no wonder to find our Author miſtaken in matters of this Nature, when in ſo publick a thing as that King *Edward* had but one Parliament in his whole Reign, he hath not been at the pains to turn over the Book of Statutes; for there he would have found, that King *Edward*'s firſt Parliament was diſſolved the 15*th* of *April* 1552; and a Second Parliament was called, and opened the Firſt of *March* following, and was diſſolved the laſt Day of that ſame Month. So that there were two Parliaments in this Reign, and the Second was diſſolved by an Act of the King's, and not by his Death. I do confeſs theſe are not great Matters; yet this may be drawn out of them, that our Author, who pretends to have examined the Tranſactions of that Time, with ſo much exactneſs, took things upon truſt, without giving himſelf the trouble to enquire into them ſo critically, as was neceſſary for one that was reſolved to paſs a Judgment upon them.

P. 127. XXVII. He expoſtulates upon the Inhibition of preaching put upon the Biſhops, except in their own Cathedrals; which agrees ill with the Cenſure that *Fox* paſſes upon them, as Dumb Prelates. And after this there was a general Inhibition on the whole Clergy, hindring them to preach, till a Uniform Order of Doctrine ſhould be ſet out; in which ſome Biſhops, and other Learned Men, were then employed by the King's Order. As for this Inhibi-

Inhibition upon Biſhops to preach, except in their Cathedrals, it is a Fiction of our Author's, for which he can give no Voucher; they were not ſo much as reſtrained from giving Licences to preach, much leſs to preach themſelves over their Dioceſs. The ſecond and general Reſtraint, as it was but for a very ſhort while, ſo the Thing is very doubtful, and ſtands only on *Fuller*'s Credit, who was too careleſs a Writer to be appealed to in any Matter of Conſequence.

XXVIII. Our Author cites here the Diſcourſe of *Communion in one kind*, which by all appearance is that lately writ by the *Biſhop of Meaux*. This ſhews that the Author and the Publiſher is the ſame Perſon; though others pretend that the Author is dead many Years ago. But it ſeems the Publiſher thought fit at leaſt to add ſome new touches; and ſince he did that, he might have thought it worth the while to have examined at leaſt the Records publiſhed by Dr. *Burnet*; and his Hiſtory it ſelf might have been conſidered, as well as Mr. *Fullers* and Dr. *Heylins*. But ſince it ſeems our Author thought the Diſcourſe of the Communion in one kind fit to be recommended by him, I will take the liberty to recommend the Anſwer to it in French by *Monſieur Larroque*, and that lately writ in Engliſh, in which the diſingenuity of the Diſcourſe mentioned by our Author, is laid open beyond all poſſibility of replying. *P.* 134.

XXIX. He tells us, that the Veneration of Images was defined in a General Council, *the Second* *P.* 135.

Nicene, which Council alſo juſtifies it by Antiquity. That Council hath been lately ſufficiently expoſed by a Learned and Judicious Pen. It was neither a General Council, nor did it juſtify what it defined by Antiquity. The falſhood of ſome of their Allegations, and the Impertinences of the reſt, and the Inferences drawn from thoſe pretended Authorities, are all ſuch extravagant Things, that they give a juſt prejudice againſt every thing that was defined by Men that were equally void of ſincerity, and of common ſenſe.

XXX. There follows from this to the end of the Chapter, a long and laborious Vindication of the Clergy in King *Edward*'s Time, in which our Author endeavours, by many Inſtances, of which ſome were mentioned in the *Firſt Part*, to make it appear that the Clergy at that time gave only an outward compliance, that they acted againſt their Conſciences; that the Severity of that Time, tho it went no further than to the ejecting them out of their Benefices, who refuſed to comply; and to the impriſoning of a very few, yet wrought ſo much upon their weakneſs, and their love of Mony, that againſt their Perſwaſions, they complied, both in Subſcribing, Swearing, and Officiating in the Divine Service. This ſhews our Author's ſound and good Judgment, that leads him to fancy, that he hath by this Plea done any thing but blackned them in the moſt infamous manner that can be imagined. It had been much leſs ſcandalous upon them to have owned that many of them were weak and eaſy Men, ignorant and tractable, and ſo were apt to

to be ſeduced; but that in Q. *Mary*'s Time they return'd again to their old Perſuaſions. But this would not have ſerved our Author's turn, who wanted ſomewhat to excuſe his own treacherous Compliance againſt his Conſcience for ſo many Years, even after he had all that Conviction, which he owns in his Book. But if he hopes to excuſe his Crimes, by ſhewing that his own Church hath produced in former Times, Men as black and as criminal as himſelf, we do not envy him this Apology. He might perhaps have another deſign in it, but of the ſame ſize of Sincerity and good Judgment with the other. He no doubt fancied, as many more perhaps did, that the Church of *England* had many more ſuch falſe Brethren as *Himſelf* in her Boſom, who wanted only good Colours and a fair Occaſion to declare themſelves, and ſo as he had been preparing many Books, with which he hoped to overthrow us, when ever the time of publiſhing them ſhould come; he fancied this Repreſentation that he gives of the Complyance of the Popiſh Party might offer to others like himſelf ſome excuſe for their diſſembling ſo long with God and Man, only that they might enjoy the Profits of a Benefice; ſince it cannot be ſo much as pretended, that there was any other Temptation in the caſe. But God be thanked he hath had few Companions in his Apoſtacy or Treachery, let him chooſe which he will.

XXXI. Our Author cites a Paſſage out of a Letter of Q. *Mary*'s, written in her Brother's time to the Privy-Council, in which there is a Period that *P.* 142.

over-

overthrows a great many of his Aſſertions. She ſays *that ſhe was well aſſured, that the King her Fathers Laws were all allowed and conſented to without compulſion by the whole Realm, both Spiritual and Temporal.* Now if the former part of the Citation he produces makes a little againſt the Changes in King *Edward*'s time, the latter part is as ſtrong in the Juſtification of that which was done under K. *Henry.* I cannot leave this without taking notice of our Author's way of citing, which gives the juſteſt cauſe of Suſpicion that can be. The words he cites are, *I have offended no Law, unleſs it be a late Law of your own making, for the altering Matters of Religion, which is not worthy to have the Name of a Law,* both for, &c. *and for the partiality uſed in the ſame.* Now did ever Man before our Author put an *&c.* in ſuch a place? I have not *Fox* by me, from whom this is cited, but I am ſure this way of cutting a Sentence doth not look fair.

P. 157. XXXII. I paſs over many Particulars, which are Repetitions of things that have been already conſidered, relating to the Inſtances in which the King's Supremacy was exerciſed. Only where he complains of the reſtoring the Cup to the Laity, as contrary to the Injunction of the Council of *Conſtance,* I muſt acknowledg his Sincerity in not pretending to carry the Violation of our Saviour's Inſtitution of the Sacrament higher than the 15*th* Century. We are not aſhamed to own that our Reformers thought it better to follow the firſt 14 Centuries, eſpecially ſince our Lord's Inſtitution was

was at the Head of them, then ſo late and ſo treacherous an Aſſembly, that had overthrown all the Confidence that can be among Men, as well as it had ſacrilegiouſly robbed the People of a Right that was derived to them by our Saviour's expreſs Words.

XXXIII. He quarrels the Form of Ordination ſet out in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, becauſe *in contradiction to all Antiquity that part was caſt out, by which a Biſhop gives to Prieſts a Power to offer up Sacrifices, and to ſay Maſſes for the Dead and the Living.* It ſeems our Author knows Antiquity, as well as he doth the Hiſtory of our Reformation; otherwiſe he had never pretended that a Form that is no elder than the *8th Century* was the Practice of all Antiquity. This is ſo clear to all, who have examined this matter, that it is needleſs to urge it farther. The Silence of all ancient Authors, the Form mentioned by the *4th* Council of *Carthage*, by the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, and by *Denis* the *Areopagite*, and the ancient *Rituals*, printed by *Morinus*, are ſuch clear Proofs in this matter, that I may well ſave my ſelf a farther Labour. *P.* 160.

XXXIV. He gives another Exception againſt our Book of Ordinations, that *inſtead of the Oath of Submiſſion to the Patriarch, there was another Oath preſcribed to the Temporal Prince.* Our Author muſt needs know, that the Oath which was formerly ſworn to the Pope, was a plain Oath of Homage, ſuch as Subjects ſwear to their Princes, by which all Biſhops were bound to the Popes, and *Ibid.*

to

to the Regalities of St. *Peter* as to their Leige Lord, in the ſame form of Words, in which Vaſſals ſwore Homage to their Superiour Lords, and it was no wonder to ſee our Legiſlators change that into an Oath of Supremacy to our Temporal Prince. In the Primitive Times there was no ſuch thing as either Oath or Promiſe of Obedience to Superiours in Ordinations, and it was not before the End of the *7th* Century, that a Promiſe of Obedience was requir'd, yet *Charles the Great* found ill Effects of this, and ſo got it to be condemned by the unanimous Conſent of the Second Council of *Chalons*: And *Radulphus Glaber* tells us, that in the *11th* Century an ill Cuſtom was creeping in, that none was ordain'd Deacon, till he had firſt ſworn Obedience to his Biſhop. Among the *Rituals* publiſhed by *Morinus* in the *4th*, there is only mention of a Promiſe of Submiſſion and Obedience to the See, in the *9th Ritual*, which he believes to be about 700 Years old; there is an Oath of Obedience indeed to the *Patriarchal See*, but this is far from any claim to Antiquity, ſince it is plain it did not begin to be exacted, till the *Popes* began to raiſe their Pretenſions far beyond that of a *Patriarch*; and ſo this Oath was ſoon formed to ſo high a ſtrain, that no Temporal Prince whatſoever had his Subjects more ſtrictly bound to him, than all Biſhops were ſubjected to the Pope as their Temporal as well as their Spiritual Head, which will appear to every one, who will give himſelf the trouble of reading it.

Tolet. can. 10. §. 75. *c.* 13.

1040.

Vita Gul. Abb. Dijon. c. 4.

XXXV.

XXXV. He quarrels our Liturgy for leaving the Oblation to God of the Holy Euchariſt, as propitiatory or impetratory of any Benefits for the Living or to the Dead; contrary to the Belief of former Churches and Councils. If by former he means the Ages of Darkneſs, that had preceded the Reformation, this we eſteem no Reproach; but if he will carry this matter higher, it is eaſie to ſhew they had no other Notion of a Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, than ſuch as we ſtill retain, which is a Commemoration of that one Sacrifice, by which we were reconciled to God, and a Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiving upon it, which we ſtill retain, and according to the Spirit of the Ancient Church we uſe the term *Sacrifice*. And here our Author betrays that malignancy of Spirit, which he bears our Church in accuſing us for ſome Changes that our Reformers made in the Liturgy, as if theſe had been ſuch heinous things. Whereas the Changes that the Roman Church hath made have been of another nature, and they have ſo altered all their Books of Divine Offices, that if any will compare the *Ordo Romanus*, which was a Ritual of the 10*th* or 11*th* Century, with the *Miſſals* at preſent, it will appear how inconſiderable the Changes that our *Reformers* made, are, when compared to thoſe of that Church. If any will take the Pains to examine the Books of *Ordination*, that are collected by *Morinus*, he will ſee that the Prayers, which in one Age were eſteemed P. 162.

the Forms of *Ordination*, came to be conſidered in another but as preparatory Devotions. And that the Prayers which in one time were only Bleſſings after Orders given, were at another time looked on, as the formal Words by which they were given. Since then all Churches, chiefly that of *Rome*, have ſo often changed their Divine Offices, it is a very unreaſonable thing to reproach the *Church* of *England* for having done it once or twice in the beginning of the Reformation.

P. 176, 273. XXXVI. Our Author it ſeems thinks he hath a privilege to reproach our Church, in ſpite of the cleareſt Diſcoveries that can be made; ſo though that Worthy and Learned Perſon that anſwered his two Diſcourſes concerning the *Real Preſence*, and the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament*, had from the light given in Dr. *Burnet*'s Hiſtory, anſwered the Objection he had made from the Alteration in the Article of the Sacrament concerning the Preſence, a great deal of the Explanation that was made in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, being left out under Queen *Elizabeth*. Yet it is clear, by the Original Subſcription, which I my ſelf viewed in *Bennet College* Library, that all the Clergy were of the ſame mind with thoſe of King *Edward*'s Time; only upon a prudential Conſideration it was not thought neceſſary to publiſh it; ſo that it was not caſt out, but ſuppreſſed. Common Decency ſhould have obliged our Author not to have mentioned this any more, or to have anſwered that which had been ſaid

ſaid upon it. But it ſeems with the new Religion he hath got, he hath received a moſt indelible degree of Impudence.

XXXVII. Our Author engages into a long enquiry concerning the Articles of Religion that were printed in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time; and hath indeed offered ſome Things, that ſeem to leave it doubtful, whether they were agreed to in a Convocation, or not. But all this is a Matter of very ſmall Importance, if theſe Articles were not paſſed in Convocation in King *Edward*'s Reign, we are ſure they were agreed too in Convocation in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign. And it is no great matter to us, whether they are ten Years older or later, that is, whether they were agreed to in the Year 1552, or in the Year 1562. It is more likely they were agreed to in King *Edward*'s Time, for they were printed then with that Title; and though Impoſtures are but too ordinary to be determined by the baldneſs of a Title Page, yet things are ſeldom printed, as flowing from ſuch a publick Authority, when it is known that they are the Projects of a few Heads that would impoſe upon the World. It cannot now be known from the Records of the Convocation, they being all burnt; but it is certain, that ſoon after in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time, theſe Articles were ever looked on as the Work of the Convocation in King *Edward*'s Time. Nor is there any reaſon to think otherwiſe; for by that time, in which it is ſaid they were made, the Bi- *P.* 187.

ſhopricks were ſo filled, and the Clergy were every where ſo compliant, that there is no reaſon to think that the regular way was not taken in a Matter of this nature. As long as the Popiſh Party was the Majority, our Reformers were obliged to carry Matters by ſome ſelected Biſhops and Divines, whoſe Propoſitions were enacted by the Civil Authority: but when the Clergy was by degrees wrought to give a more univerſal concurrence in the Reformation, which was done before the Year 1552. we have no reaſon to think that the regular Method was neglected. But it is to very little purpoſe to ſpend many words concerning a matter of ſmall conſequence, and in which there is ſo little certainty.

P. 208. XXXVIII. Our Author ſhews how dry all his Conceſſions are in favour of the Civil Authority in oppoſition to the Papal Pretenſions not only for depoſing, but even for aſſaſſinating Heretical Princes, in theſe words. *It ſhall here be granted (as being the Opinion of ſeveral Catholicks) that no general Council hath any Authority to make any Eccleſiaſtical Law, which any way intrenches upon any Civil Right: nor any Foreign Prelate hath Authority to uſe a Temporal Power over Princes (when judged Heretical) to kill or depoſe them, or abſolve their Subjects from their Allegiance.* The King is certainly much obliged to our Author, who hath given him ſuch an Aſſurance, of enjoying his Crown and his Life. For he grants it here as he ſaid elſewhere

 he

he would not be thought to juſtify the *burning of Hereticks in this place.* So here while he is in *England*, he will condemn theſe treaſonable Doctrines. The ground upon which he condemns them is alſo ſuitable to the Condemnation it ſelf. For he ſays that this is the Opinion of ſeveral Catholicks. This was modeſtly expreſſed. For tho it is true, that ſeveral of thoſe he calls *Catholicks*, are of this mind, yet all Catholicks are not of it. So that the Doctrine of murdering Kings, is at leaſt a *probable* one, and ſince the Decrees of the Church of *Rome* for the depoſing of Princes, fall not only on thoſe that are Hereticks themſelves, but even on the *Fautors and Favourers of Hereticks*, I do not ſee how his Majeſty's Life is ſecured. For beſides the Protection and Liberty that he grants to Hereticks of his own Dominions, he hath received and encouraged the Refuges of another Prince, which is to be a Favourer of Hereſy of the worſt ſort. So that if *Innuendoes* were in faſhion, I do not ſee how our Author could defend himſelf againſt an Indictment of Treaſon, or at leaſt againſt an Information. Our Author to let us ſee how wary he is in his Conceſſions, as he calls them, ends the Paragraph with another, *It ſhall be granted here.* For it is plain, he will not looſe an inch of all the Papal Pretenſions, but will preſerve them entire to a better time.

XXXIX.

P. 120. XXXIX. Our Author pretends that Q. *Elizabeth*'s Supremacy was carried much higher, than *had been granted by the former Clergy under K.* Henry *the 8th.* The Allegation is falſe, for the Supremacy was carried much higher under King *Henry*, than it was under Queen *Elizabeth*, who, as ſhe would not accept of the Title of *Head of the Church*, ſo ſhe explained her Supremacy, both in her own Injunctions, and in the Acts of Convocation and Parliament that followed, in ſo unexceptionable a manner, that our Author himſelf hath nothing to object to it. He ſeems alſo to inſinuate, as if the King's Supremacy were aſſerted by us, as a Grant of the Clergy; whereas we pretend to no ſuch thing. The Civil Supremacy that we aſcribe to our Princes, is founded on the Laws of God, on the Rules of Humane Society, on the Laws of *England*, and on the Practice of the Church for many Ages; and King *Henry* receiv'd no new ſtrengthning of his Title by the Act of the Clergy, which did not confer any new Authority on him, but only declared that which was already inherent in him.

P. 2. XL. Our Author enters into a long Diſcourſe to prove the Invalidity of Orders granted in our Church, which he doth ſo weakly, and yet as he doth all other things ſo tediouſly, and with ſo much Confuſion, that I have no mind to follow him

him in all his wandrings. He ſeems to queſtion the Authority of *Suffragan Biſhops*, who though they were limited as to their *Juriſdiction*, yet as to their Order, they were the ſame with the other *Biſhops*.

The Proceedings in Queen *Mary*'s Time, were too full of Irregularity and Violence, to be brought as Proofs, that the *Orders* given by King *Edward*'s Book, were not valid. In a word, the Foundation of that falſe Opinion of ſome of the Church of *Rome*, was that ever ſince the Time of the Council of *Florence*, the Form in which Prieſts Orders were conferred, was believed to be the delivering the Sacred Veſſels, with a power *to offer Sacrifices for the Dead and Living*. So they reckoned, that we had no true Prieſts, ſince that Ceremony was ſtruck out of our *Ordinal*. But the folly of all this is apparent, ſince Men began to examine the Ancient *Rituals*; and thoſe which have been publiſhed by *Morinus*, ſhew, that as this Rite is peculiar to the *Roman Church*, ſo it was not received before the Ninth *Century*. And ſince all *Ordinations*, during the firſt Eight Centuries, were done by the Impoſition of Hands and Prayer, then there can be no reaſon to queſtion our Orders, ſince we retain ſtill all that the *Ancient Church* thought neceſſary.

As for the common Obſervation of our *Ordinals* not being enacted by Queen *Elizabeth*, before the Eighth Year of her Reign, it hath been ſo oft made and anſwered, that I am amazed to ſee

our

our Author urge it any further. Would he that hath diſputed ſo much againſt the Civil Authorities medling in Matters Sacred, annul our *Orders*, becauſe the Law was not ſo clearly worded, with relation to that part of our Offices? The moſt that can poſſibly be made out of this, is, that the *Ordinations* were not quite legal; ſo that one might have diſputed the paiment of the *Fruits*. But this hath no relation to us, as we are a Church; in that the Book of *Ordinations* having been annexed to the Book of Common-Prayer in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time, the reviving of the Book of Common-Prayer in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time was conſidered, as including the Book of *Ordinations*. Though its not being expreſly named, this gave occaſion to *Bonner* to queſtion the validity of them in Law. Upon which the Explanatory Act paſſed, declaring that it had been the Intention of the Parliament to include that in the Book of Common-Prayer. So that this Act only declared the Law, but did not create any new Right.

I have now gone over all that I judged moſt material in this tedious Book. The darkneſs of the ſtile, the many unfiniſhed Periods, the frequent Repetitions, the many long Quotations to very little purpoſe, above all the intricate way of Reaſoning, made it a very ungrateful thing to me to wreſtle through it. In it one may ſee how much a Man may labour and ſtudy to very little purpoſe. For how unhappy ſoever the Author hath been in his pains, it cannot be denied but he hath

hath been at a great deal to compaſs it. But a Man that neither ſees things diſtinctly, nor judges well of them, the more he toils about them, he entangles himſelf and his Reader ſo much the more. So that never was ſo much pains taken to leſs purpoſe.

If our Author gives us many more Books of this ſize, both as to Sincerity and good Reaſoning, he will quickly cure the World of the Miſtake in which they were concerning him.

He paſſed once for a Learned Man, and he had paſſed ſo ſtill, if he had not taken care to let the World ſee, by ſo many repeated Eſſays, how falſe a Title he hath to that Reputation which had fallen upon him. But it ſeems his Sincerity and good Judgment are of a piece. Otherwiſe as he could not obtrude on the World the falſehoods concerning latter times, and the Ignorance of Antiquity that appears in all his Books; ſo when ſo many have been at the pains to diſcover both his Miſtakes, and his Impoſtures; He would either have confeſſed them, or ſome way excuſed them. But it is no wonder to ſee a Man that diſſembled ſo long with God, and that *lied* ſo oft to him, ſerve the World now, as he did his God for ſo many Years.

I pray God touch his Heart, and give him a Repentance proportioned to the heinouſneſs of his Sins, by which he hath given ſo much Scandal to the Atheiſtical ſort of Men, who from

him muſt be tempted to draw ſtrange Conſequences. And he hath certainly brought a greater Reproach on that Church to which he hath gone over, than all the Services he can ever render them in his uſeleſs and confounded Writings, will be able to wipe off.

But to whom ſovever he hath been a Reproach, our Church hath no ſhare in it, ſince of him, and of ſuch as he is, we muſt ſay; *They went out from us, but they were not of us: For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that it might be made manifeſt that they were not all of us.*

FINIS.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION